THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXVI APRIL, 1938 No. 214

EDITORIAL

Three documents have been published by the Joint Conference of Anglicans and Free Churchmen which has been sitting for a long time under the Chairmanship of the Archbishop of York. The Preface to them is signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and Dr. Garvie. Two of them we need only to commend heartily for their interest. "1662 and To-day" gives an acute analysis of the spiritual result of the passage of 272 years, and describes very justly the much more promising atmosphere which exists now. In 1662 a recent restoration after a period of exile and persecution went rather to the heads of the Bishops, and a packed House of Commons was eager to harry the Dissenters into uniformity. Now we are much more sensitive to the real signs of the times, and much more ready to think the best rather than the worst of one another. Nor do we hanker after uniformity. Nor does the House of Commons pass Acts of Parliament intended to make things difficult for Nonconformists. A second pamphlet, "The Practice of Inter-Communion and the Doctrine of the Church," is content to record the existence of three convictions, that commonly entertained by Free Churchmen, and two different views which are held among ourselves. *Inter alia* it perceives that "Anglicans may be justified in abstention from Inter-Communion without any lack of charity or appreciation of the spiritual values preserved in traditions other than their own." There is some historical material in this pamphlet, which will be useful in informing many readers about the way in which others have arrived at their conclusions. It will explain the degree of realism that lay behind the apparent flippancy of Streeter's famous quotation from the verdict of the Caucus Race. Even those of us who would hesitate to admit that "all have won" must acknowledge that, what with "our

perseverance" and "their obstinacy," nobody seems willing to admit defeat. It is rather like war, and the moral of the situation is perhaps that another method must be tried.

That is all very well, but the nature of the difficulty emerges when we come to the third and longest pamphlet, "Outline of a Reunion Scheme for the Church of England and the Evangelical Free Churches of England." We have considered this with all the sympathy that we could command. We know that if A is to understand B, whether B be Italy, or Russia, or the English Free Churches, or any other neighbour, a community or an individual, A must obtain temporary leave of absence from his own skin and do his best to occupy for a time the skin of B. On the other hand he must also remember that he belongs to the A class, that he proposes, after his temporary translation, to spend the remainder of his life in A territory, or, if the best comes to the best, in A B territory. He must remember, in fact, that he is A. There are those who, in their sympathy for a race, a creed, a tradition, other than their own, have gone about it in such a way that they have lightly crossed the chasm on a plank, and have kicked away the plank behind them, a thing which an ambassador should never do. It means that he may become so naturalized, so impregnated with "B"-ishness that he no longer represents the "A" side. This indiscretion we hope to avoid.

There is in the document much of constructive value, evidence of a genuinely co-operative spirit. This appears in the discussion of questions relating to the Church, the Faith, the Ministry and the mysteries of sacramental grace. There is also evidence of an advance made by Free Churchmen in a less vital matter, but one in which it may well have been hard for some of them to make a move. It is acknowledged that spiritual freedom "does not necessarily exclude some form of State *recognition* of the Church." The chief advantage of the form of the document is that it contains an actual concrete draft constitution. The inevitable question, "But what do you really mean?" which rises to the lips when a vague exhortation to unity is heard, is at least partly answered. For convenience and for clarity, "the united Church of England" is freely spoken of, and the word "shall" is freely used. Thus:

Those only shall be members of the united Church of England who have by Baptism been admitted to Christ's Church visible on earth.

Or thus:

> All persons who have been confirmed or have been admitted as communicants by any of the services of admission which were in use in any of the uniting Churches before union, shall be recognized as communicants throughout the united Church of England.

At the same time it is clearly stated that:

> None of those who have been responsible for the preparation of the scheme in its various stages expects that it will be carried into effect in this form. Further discussion is bound to produce important alterations in it, but discussion is only fruitful where it is concentrated on some definite proposal. There can be but little valuable discussion of reunion in England until a scheme is suggested. It is hoped that what is now presented may prove a useful basis for further work towards the attainment of reunion.

On the other hand it should be realized that the scheme is not at all points complete. Almost nothing is here said of the interim arrangements on which so much would depend.

The document assumes that, inasmuch as there is one Spirit, one Lord, one God and Father of all, there must be one Body. There is already *Una Sancta*, but there must be, let us say, *Una Catholica*. The attainment of this is pictured on the lines of "Lambeth 1920," as a union reached, not by absorption, as of FC by AC, or of AC or AFC by RC, nor by an engineered combination, but by some process of a vital, organic quality, with a suggestion of "bone to his bone." To the Fellowship thus by faith imagined Baptism admits, and if the Report acknowledges that the Quakers will then present a problem, there are few of us who would not acknowledge that they present a problem now. Where Baptism has been administered in infancy, "communicant status shall be attained only upon a profession of faith, following upon due instruction and sealed in a public service of confirmation, or such other service of attaining communicant status as shall be agreed upon." In view of the fact that the Episcopate has been universally accepted "from early times and for many centuries, and by the greater part of Christendom is still accepted, as the means by which the authority of the whole Church is given, we agree that it ought to be accepted as such for the united Church of England. . . . The acceptance of Episcopal ordination for the future would not imply the disowning (Query—By whom ?) of past ministries of Word and Sacrament otherwise received." It is assumed that the Episcopate will be continuous with "the Historic Episcopate in its succession from apostolic times, but it also expected that "various theories

regarding the character and origin of the Episcopate" will be held. So far as concerns orthodoxy the language used recalls that of Lausanne, at which Orthodox delegates were present. The Apostles' and Nicene Creeds are accepted "as witnessing to and safeguarding that Faith, which is continuously verified in the spiritual experience of the Church and its members, and as containing a sufficient statement thereof for a basis of reunion. . . . This acceptance of the Holy Scriptures and of the Creeds does not exclude reasonable liberty of interpretation."

This is, broadly speaking, the South India scheme. There are various difficulties, which will either prove insuperable or will be overcome. The first is that the fact of episcopacy is felt by many to be not enough by itself, apart from any guarantee that the interpretation put upon it will be that of Catholic theology. The point is serious. We do not want the mere compromise, ingenious enough just to satisfy the letter of the law, but destitute of spiritual value. On the other hand, we have had some experience among ourselves of different interpretations put upon the same thing, and the feeling that we ought to trust in the power of the truth is healthy. "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God" is a needed warning, but there is also the example of the pilgrim who, on the strength of faith in a divine command, "went out, not knowing whither he went." As Father Hebert has said in *Inter-Communion*, "The foundation of Catholic Order is the actuality of the Episcopate, not some human doctrine of it." Another obstacle is the thought of the irregularity which would prevail during the interim period—*i.e.*, while the non-episcopally ordained ministers were still ministering. There is, as in the South India Scheme, a "Gentleman's Agreement" to the effect that:

> "The Church, therefore, pledges itself that it will not in any of its administrative acts, knowingly trangress the long established traditions of any of the Churches from which it has been formed. Neither forms of worship or ritual, nor a ministry to which they have not been accustomed, or to which they conscientiously object, will be imposed upon any congregation; and no arrangements with regard to these matters will knowingly be made, either generally or in particular cases, which would either offend the conscientious convictions of persons directly concerned, or which would hinder the development of complete unity within the Church, or imperil its progress towards union with other Churches.

Further, this scheme is free from a difficulty which does attend the South India scheme. An additional problem for the South India United Church would be the arrival from time

to time of ministers from England who had not received episcopal orders at home and would expect to be recognized in the United Church. This would prolong the interim period, perhaps indefinitely. Under the present scheme, episcopacy having been once accepted as the order for the future, there would be no further supply of ministers from other sources, and all ministers would eventually be in episcopal orders.

In the effort to arrive at a true conclusion in these things, it is vital to have in mind all the time the real aim. The real aim is nothing less than organic union, with free and full Inter-Communion as its necessary consequence. There are some on our side who do not really want that, who want only to keep what they have and to be recognized in quarters where they are at present not recognized, and do not themselves want to be pressed to give any fresh recognitions. On the other side there are some Free Churchmen who do not want union, only to be recognized. The real aim is " Neither in this mountain " only, " nor in Jerusalem " only, but " in spirit and in truth." The beautiful extract from the writings of Abbé Couturier, printed last month, describes the atmosphere in which union is to be sought. But anyone who can at all attain that atmosphere will want to embody the ideal. The writer of a paper printed this month has seen the weak point of " Whither Reunion ?" a Presbyterian article published by us in December. It was well-intended, but its scope was not quite wide enough and its reach was not quite deep enough. It was concerned with something less than the real thing.

It did not touch the deep point. Canon Lempriere, this month, like Father Hebert, recalls us to Lambeth 1920. Does the Outline Scheme, rich in promise as it is, go to the point touched at Lambeth ? We are not clear that it does. Perhaps it could not. Lambeth was theory. This is practice. Practice is always much more liable than theory to make mistakes. There is also peril in the fact that it is a sectional scheme, as between Free Churchmen and ourselves. That is by no means fatal. There must be sectional schemes. The essay by Dom Lambert Beauduin of Arnay, " The Church of England United, not Absorbed," which took away the breath of the English representatives at Malines in May, 1925, was a sectional scheme. But sectional schemes must remember that they are sectional. Not from fear of consequence, but from love of truth. Love of truth involves willingness to consider all the evidence. We are not satisfied that the crucial facts of the

existence and the relevance of Rome and the Orthodox East have been held in mind enough. We sympathize with Free Churchmen in their impatience of what may seem to them unnecessary nervousness. But we can assure them that our caveats and provisos are not like Mr. Spenlow's appeal to Mr. Jorkins, a convenient cloak for our own stubbornness. The thing on which we must continually harp is not even the actual existence of the Churches in East or West, great as they are. It is rather the compelling authority of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, which is a truth of faith, towards the incarnation of which we are advancing so hopefully, but it is not yet a truth of fact. There is no reason why the process should not move forward in sections, but the sectional plan must be aware of, and not incompatible with, the larger plan which is known only to God and faith.

Finally, the Editor reports that he was cheered to hear, from Anglican and from Presbyterian quarters in U.S.A. last December, of renewed conversations between representatives of those Churches about the actual proposal made at Lambeth in 1920. He has always believed in that because it seemed to him a truth-trusting, God-dependent, and not question-begging plan. There was no attempt to determine precisely to what extent ministers who have been ordained in any manner lack complete authorization by the whole Church. Clearly, all lack something, because they have behind them the authority of part only of the whole Church. How much does a Methodist or an Anglican lack ? Who can say ? But if there could be a procedure by which all could receive whatever God may know to be lacking to them, it would be, as Maurice would have said, a procedure resting not on man but on the truth of God.

THE VIRGIN BIRTH

THE Catholic Church from sub-apostolic times has believed that the Blessed Virgin Mary conceived Our Lord Jesus Christ by the empowering action of the life-giving Divine Spirit without the agency of any other human being than herself. Modern knowledge and thought have brought upon us the need to find out whether we have got the belief rightly or not. It is not a question of the blind defence of a tradition; but rather we are to see if we may not arrive by synthesis of the traditionalist and modernist points of view at a more spiritual and intelligent grasp of the doctrine. Some in the Church are contending that the story is not history and has only a symbolic value. In this case it is an allegory of spiritual truth, a mythical representation of the Incarnation. But there are some who will contend that the spiritual value of a story, which on the face of it claims to record history, will be greatest if the alleged event actually happened. All are agreed that it is the value which matters.

I

The literary evidence must come briefly under review. St. Luke and the First Gospel both have Birth Narratives which agree upon the Virgin Birth, though they differ in much else. St. Luke's account with its record of the Annunciation is primary. We should note its Hebraic style, and that it is written from the point of view of Mary. It must be much older than the Third Gospel as a whole. Indeed, the tone of the story, and more especially of the songs, is so much one of unresisted triumph, that we shall be inclined to put the date before Our Lord's rejection by the Jews. "Matthew's" account, though independent, is secondary, being given with much less detail and poetic power from Joseph's point of view. The First Gospel as a whole is Palestinian, and this part no less than the rest. The special contribution of "Matthew" is his attempt to justify the Virgin Birth from Old Testament prophecy; but we should not be ready to accept the story in "Matthew" unless we had already been influenced by study of the Third Gospel.

The rest of the New Testament evidence is very slight indeed. St. Mark nowhere alludes to the Virgin Birth. But then, it was not in his province to do so. His business was to set

forth the Gospel in terms of the witness of those who had been with Jesus from the beginning of His ministry. St. Paul also never alludes to the story, though we may fairly say that he regarded the Birth of Jesus Christ as no ordinary act. Yet the Virgin Birth did not seemingly enter into his scheme of teaching. The Fourth Gospel contains no direct evidence; but there does appear to be a reflection of the stories in the Third and First Gospels in i. 13, "which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." This passage would become a direct allusion if we could accept the ancient Latin variant, "was born," for "were born." The Fourth Gospel also bears witness to the fact of something strange about the Birth of Christ when it makes the Jews say in viii. 41, "*We* were not born of fornication." This seems to hint at the slander put forth by Celsus, and still occasionally heard, that Our Saviour was illegitimate. John vii. 42 seems to shew that the question of Messiah's birth at Bethlehem was of real importance to Jewish minds. The Apocalypse contains in xii. 1 foll. a reflection of the attempt of Herod on the life of the Infant Jesus, as described in Matthew ii. Otherwise we have no further New Testament evidence. We have no reason to suppose that the story was widely known until the publication of the Synoptic Gospels, and we have nothing to shew whether Jesus Himself ever knew of it.

II

A straightforward reading of the stories in Luke and Matthew gives the idea of a conception by Divine power from within the resources of Mary's own personality, and not by the ordinary processes of sexual intercourse. The Holy Spirit was active in this conception, and His sphere of activity is within the soul and conscience of man. There may be outward manifestations of His presence, as in the case of the primitive Church's "speaking with tongues," but the Scriptures present Him as acting by inward and moral influence upon the will, rather than by external and material means. Mary's work of conception was thus an effort of will strengthened and uplifted by the Divine Life-giver, in a way analogous to the moral and spiritual efforts we make for holiness under the influence of His indwelling in us through Confirmation. "Behold, the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word." This is not passive resignation: it is the active "Yes, verily; and by God's help so I will" of the Catechism. Hence, although she was pregnant, Mary could still rightly be called "the Virgin."

Is this, then, the true line of interpretation for this article of the Creed ? Does closer study of the story and its background bring to light insuperable difficulties against our acceptance of the historicity of the Virgin Birth, and compel us to fall back upon a value of the narratives as merely symbolic representations of truths about the general nature and character of Jesus ?

Is it possible, firstly, to say that the story has been made up from Old Testament sources ? The answer is in the negative. The Old Testament nowhere suggests that Messiah was to be born of a Virgin in the New Testament sense. " Matthew " quotes Isa. vii. 14: " Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son." The Hebrew word is *'almah*, a young woman, not *bethulah*, a virgin. The LXX here translates *parthenos*; but the Jews themselves have not at any time held the passage to mean a Virgin Birth in our sense, and the stress in the original is not upon the manner of His conception, but upon the time of the child's birth. Moreover, it is not established that *parthenos* in LXX usage had always the narrower sense of *bethulah*. Thus we must surely conclude, not that " Matthew " has derived the story from the text, but that he has produced the text to justify the story.

The Old Testament describes various women as bearing children under the special influence of God, Sarah and Hannah for instance. But in none of these cases is there any suggestion of dispensing with sexual intercourse, and the part of the husband, as in the case of Hannah, is sometimes definitely stated. The Hebrew mind saw no incompatibility between Religion and the union of the sexes in marriage, but it repudiated with horror the notion of such union between Divine and human beings. In Gen. vi. the intrigues of the " sons of God " with the daughters of men are a cause of God's decision to destroy human life from the earth.

Secondly, can we find the sources of the Gospel stories outside the Old Testament in heathen religion ? We must notice in this connection the intensely Jewish character of the literary evidence, and its obvious dependence for style and phrasing upon the Old Testament. Any literary connection with heathen sources is quite out of the question. But it is at least worth while to ask whether these sources do, in point of fact, contain anything which could give rise to the Christian stories.

Primitive peoples quite readily ascribe the birth of children to causes other than sexual intercourse. The Australian Arunta are said to be ignorant that there is any connection between the two. Chinese folk-lore tells how Fo-hi, the

ancestor of the race, was conceived because his mother ate a magic flower which clung to her garment while she was bathing. We find tales of gods who took the form of substances such as pebbles which were swallowed by women, and the children who were thus conceived were really the substances, alias the gods, under a human form. Contact with the sun's rays is also a cause of conception in folk-lore. But in all these tales the conception results from some external cause: they none of them give any idea of a conception from within the divinely inspired personal resources of the mother.

Greek and Roman mythologies, and the mythologies of other lands besides Greece and Rome, contain stories of heroes who were the offspring of gods and human mothers. These are mostly survivals of very primitive forms of religion, usually connected with fertility and vegetation cults. At a certain stage of religion it was the duty of select women, often the chief's daughters, to submit to the embraces of the god, in order to stimulate the growth of the crops. Actually on such occasions the office of the god was probably performed by a priest of the god's sanctuary, but if there were a child of this commerce he would be regarded as a child of the god. The Ritual Marriage was a solemn and serious affair which gave rise to nothing lewd or improper in the minds of the worshippers, and there was no stain upon the honour of the mother or on the child. The intense need of fertility would nourish the suggestion that such a child was an earnest of future blessings, a Deliverer. In some places at seasonal festivals a general sexual intercourse of a ritual kind was practised with the same end of the promotion of fertility in view. And again, we must remember that, horrible as such rites appear to us, they were accepted as a proper element in religion by those who took part in them. But, clearly, there is nothing in all this from which the Gospel stories could be derived, for the mothers were not virgins, or even supposed to be virgins. Higher Greek thought came to be very ashamed of these survivals in its mythology, and we cannot easily imagine Christian writers, who wanted to help converts out of heathen associations, harking back to such things.

Some have asserted that Virgin Birth is a common story about great men, and means no more than a popular inability to account for the rise of genius by ordinary causes. Thus it is recorded that the mother of Augustus, Our Lord's elder contemporary, was visited while she was sleeping in the temple of Apollo by a serpent which left its mark upon her, and this visitation was taken to mean that Apollo was the father of Augustus. The case of the Buddha is cited more often. One

of the Birth Stories relates that the Buddha in his high heaven decided to be born once more on earth for the enlightenment of men. So he chose his father and mother, Suddhana and Maya. Maya dreamed that the Buddha entered her womb from the side in the shape of a white elephant, and after the dream she refused to have further intercourse with her husband. The story belongs to late Buddhist variation of Indian folk-lore, in which the Buddha is made to be born very many times in all sorts of forms: it is not presented as the canonical and critical history of the origin of the human Gautama. And there is here no parallel with the Christian story, for there is no suggestion that Maya was a virgin.

Non-Christian survivals and legends cannot thus be the origins or sources of the Gospel story. But this is not to say that they have no bearing whatever upon the problem. If we begin from the Christian story as the record of an historical event, these legacies from Primitive Religion can be viewed as part of the preparation for the Incarnation. Behind even the horrors of phallic orgies and ritual marriages there was a truth, and that truth came with the Annunciation.

A more serious difficulty arises for those who whole-heartedly accept the doctrine of the Incarnation. "The Word," says the Fourth Gospel, "became flesh." But would a being who came into the world by a miracle be really human? Would not the Virgin Birth mean, by a sort of inverted Arianism, that Our Lord was not quite one of us, and therefore unable to be truly our Saviour? It is very necessary to interpret the Gospel Birth Narratives in such a way as to shew that the Virgin Birth was within the possibilities of nature. At this point we must freely confess our ignorance. The Sciences seem to know little of the causes of birth. Is it not strange that in A.D. 1938 parents in begetting children seem to have no power to decide upon the sex of the children? It would be rash, therefore, to assume that sexual intercourse is the one and only cause of conception which is naturally possible. We may look to future advances of Science to shew us the way to an interpretation of the Virgin Birth which will adequately guard the reality of Our Lord's manhood.

III

We have seen that neither Judaism nor heathen mythology contain the material which we can take as the sources of the Virgin Birth stories. We have also seen how dangerous these stories must have been in the first days, partly in view of possible slander and confusion with heathenish notions, and

partly as raising possible difficulties about Our Lord's manhood. Can we imagine anyone inventing these stories from no foundation at all, or running the risk of publishing them if he knew that they were fiction? Is it not, in fact, impossible to account for the Christian Birth Narratives unless they are literally and historically true?

But if they are historical fact, what is their value?

St. Luke regards the purpose of the Virgin Birth as twofold: it is the proper way for Messiah to be born, and it is connected with the holiness of Jesus. "Matthew" also regards the Virgin Birth as a mark of Messiahship, and in doing so lays stress on Messiah's work in saving from sin. We must beware of giving the Evangelists' phrases the technical sense of later theology. Messiah is not seen here as the Eternal Second of the Holy Trinity. The seed of the full-grown theological idea may be there, but it is quite undeveloped. The Virgin Birth cannot, therefore, be a representation in mythical form of the Incarnation.

Are the great heroes of the human race born in just the ordinary way? On the lower side of human life we are well aware that illegitimacy and "broken homes" lead to mental and moral degeneracy in the children. May it not be that abnormal circumstances are a condition of the origin of the great benefactors of mankind; as, indeed, the non-Christian legends suggest? The kind of abnormality which will naturally come into our minds is the moral one, rather than any physical peculiarity of the birth. Certainly, it is the moral factor which stands out clearest in the Virgin Birth Stories. Consider the bravery of the Virgin in entering upon an experience for which there was no known precedent. What is without precedent is unintelligible; and what is unintelligible is always terrifying. Yet this heroic woman was willing to do God's will. Consider the cost she might have to pay in social obloquy and domestic disaster. Was not such bravery a fitting, perhaps a necessary, element in the conception of one who for our sins was to endure the Cross, despising the shame? Given the Cross, is it not a demand of the artist in us all that the Virgin Birth is just the right kind of way for Messiah's career to begin?

And then there is the connection of the Virgin Birth with the moral life of Jesus Himself. The Evangelists do not go so far in the Birth Stories as to say that Our Lord was sinless, or even that He was free of Original Sin. Perhaps they imply no more than the abiding influence for good upon Jesus of a mother who remembered always how she came to bear Him. There is a danger, which some in the Church have not escaped, of our overlooking the fact that, good as Mary was, she was

not without sin, and needed the Salvation of the Cross, as we all do. The Lord, because He was born of a woman, born under the Law, was not thereby freed from the common human limitations. The "entail of sin" could not be "cut off," since a mother passes on the "entail" as much as a father, and we know that the first Christians thought of Jesus as tempted in all points like as we are. There is, perhaps, less objection to the phrase, "humanity in Him had a fresh start." What He achieved for us on the Cross, through the Resurrection and Ascension, and set free at Pentecost, was in Him to achieve from the first. We Christians, who are His Body, have had the fresh start against sin, and His Body began on earth by what we call the Virgin Birth.

All this has been painfully crude and raw. We know nothing more than the least part of the mystery of the Lord's origin, and we may be thankful for the growth of doubts, the resolving of which will lead to a better appreciation of it. This is one of the matters for which the great Hindu prayer is appropriate: "The most excellent glory of the Lord, the Giver of Life; may He illumine our understandings."

J. W. Parker.

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF BETHUNE-BAKER

Among the most interesting attempts to restate the doctrine of Christ for our day is the work of Dr. J. F. Bethune-Baker, distinguished historian of Christian doctrine and until recently Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge University. Dr. Bethune-Baker, whose great work on doctrine is one of the massive productions of Anglican theology in this century, has himself admitted that for many years he was satisfied with the "classical" Christological statements. It was not until just before the War, when Bishop Gore published his famous letter on Biblical criticism, that the Cambridge theologian began to consider the need for restatement of the central tenet of the Christian faith.

Since that time, Dr. Bethune-Baker has published a number of volumes in which he has discussed this problem, and has made important suggestions towards a new Christology. Among his books one of the most valuable is *The Faith of the Apostles' Creed*, a popular statement of the essentials of Christian belief; *The Way of Modernism*, a volume of collected essays, several dealing with the Incarnation; *Letters to an Enquiring Layman*; and a number of articles and addresses which have been

published in *The Modern Churchman*. All of these shew a steady movement in the author's thought, and all point towards the same conception of the position of Christ and the particular theory of the Incarnation which Dr. Bethune-Baker feels to be most suitable for this age.

In his recent booklet, *Unity and Truth in the Church of England*, Dr. Bethune-Baker has said that any theology which excludes the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation cannot be deemed Christian, in the full sense of that term. These doctrines, in his opinion, are "the very core of our Christian creed," "the achievements of the human spirit in vital connexion with early Christian experience that has been continuous to this moment." He has little patience, therefore, with efforts to reinterpret the Christian faith without adherence to the traditional doctrines in so far as these doctrines express the continued Christian experience of God in Christ; that the Godhead is "one in plurality," and that He is specially apprehended in Christ.

With so much by way of preface, we may now turn to an examination of some of the significant points in his Christology, as represented in the booklet just mentioned, in articles in *The Modern Churchman*, in a sketch entitled *Early Traditions about Jesus*, and other works.

First of all, it is important to consider Dr. Bethune-Baker's views on the historical basis for Christological speculation. From the comprehensive study in *Early Traditions about Jesus*, we discover that the author would see much quite definite historical material for the doctrine of Christ. Our Lord was a great teacher, with a message which combined the severity of the old prophets, with their eschatological warnings, and an ethical teaching of extreme beauty and dignity. He taught love as the way of life both in this world and in the coming Kingdom. But this does not exhaust the impression made by the historic Jesus. There was about Him, as He walked in Palestine, some awful presence, some unknown quality, which called forth fear and yet had a strange attraction. He was, somehow, central to His own message, and "there was a veil of mystery surrounding Him, suggesting much more than met the eye or found expression in act and word." Indeed, in large sense "it was to account for this mystery and suggestiveness, part of the actual experience of those who knew Him in His lifetime in the world, that the later explanations and doctrines of the Church were devised."

Beyond this, however, Dr. Bethune-Baker declares that Christ has held a central place in men's hearts and minds because Christians came, "on the one hand to see in the death

of Jesus on the Cross the means of their redemption or salvation, and on the other hand to regard Him as so closely associated with God that it was at once true that God the Father gave His beloved Son to die for men and that the Son loved them and gave Himself for them." And no matter how it may be interpreted, the Resurrection was crucial for Christian faith; and thus, it was by Christ's action—in the deepest sense—that the Christian Church came into existence. "He brought it into being with Himself as a centre of it, and He said that in the Spirit He would always be with His disciples."

Upon such an historic foundation Dr. Bethune-Baker sees the rise of Christological speculation. Who could it be that had brought these things to pass? It was in the attempt to answer this question, with loyalty to the full implications of the experience of new life in and through Christ (especially as indicated in that original experience of which Christ was the centre), that the later doctrines developed, reaching their culmination in the Chalcedonian definition: two natures united in one person.

With this historical background, Dr. Bethune-Baker moves on, in his other recent works, to his doctrinal reconstruction. His fundamental claim is that on any shewing Christ must be used to interpret the whole range of reality. "Truth as truth is in Jesus is not only truth about Jesus . . . it is, for Christians, truth about the whole mystery of life, about God and Man and the World." Such a truth is "based on actual happenings on this homely earth of ours and the actual experience of men and women like ourselves." The central significance of Christ, then, when our Lord is interpreted as "pre-eminently the Son of God, one with God in mind and purpose and will—in all, that is to say, that makes up what we call our being—living and dying for the salvation of the world," is that "we have set forth to us, as in no other way, the conception of Love as the very heart of the universe, the spring of all life that is really life, and so the key to the meaning of all our experience here."

In other words, Dr. Bethune-Baker insists that the doctrine of the Incarnation must be set in the context of a world order which is "a manifestation of God, in all the stages of its evolution." "The whole is incarnation." From this position, he says, it will be seen that there can be no fundamental dualism between God and man, since the two are "indissolubly inter-related." "The Creator is not separated from His creatures; they do not exist apart from Him. They have their origin in the will and love of God." We would agree with much that has been said to this point, although the terminology

sometimes seems to indicate rather more of a " point-to-point identity " than the facts warrant. But when Dr. Bethune-Baker goes on to affirm that the creatures " are the counterparts of that will and love, as necessary to the existence of God as He is to theirs," we shall certainly hesitate. Is man really as necessary to God as God is to man ? Such an implied evolutionary monism has its dangers. The loss of the sense of the transcendence of God, no matter how thoroughly He may be active in the world, and failure to recognize the dependence upon Him of all derived reality—these can only lead to pantheism if followed to their logical conclusion. This, of course, is not done; but we feel that a more careful statement would have shewn a *pantheistic* universe, with God above and beyond it, yet active in it and present in its detail, but in varying degree of intensity.

We wish that Dr. Bethune-Baker had also dealt more fully with the concept of revelation as *activity* of God in His world. Somehow we miss this note, and also the important one of divine prevenience, both of which are of supreme value in approaching the doctrine of Christ. But we are grateful for the insistence on the congruity of Christ's revelation with our more general knowledge of God; Our Lord cannot be understood as " a bolt from the blue," but rather as one who gives meaning to that structure of Reality from which He appears.

It is recognized that such a philosophical interpretation of Christ is not explicitly found in His own teaching, but Dr. Bethune-Baker is not one of those who would regard doctrinal speculation and statement as contrary to the Spirit of Christ. Of course developed doctrine cannot be found in Jesus' teaching. " What is more to the point is that it is He and His life—His experience as man in the world, His consciousness of Himself so far as we can read it, with the new consciousness in us which He created—that suggests it."

From this point, we may turn to a more precise discussion of the historic Incarnation in Christ. What is to be maintained is that Our Lord is " the manifestation of the one true God and the way of life for mankind." Christ, therefore, is completely human—one who through and through is man, in body, mind and soul; and yet is uniquely divine. Dr. Bethune-Baker would interpret this human-divine person in the light of his incarnational-evolutionary philosophy; thus, since in our Lord we have a man at his highest, we have God most fully revealed in and to men.

We are not sure that Dr. Bethune-Baker means to equate divinity and perfect humanity, although he seems to suggest it in several places. It would be much more satisfactory to

say that it is only through the highest humanity that God is most fully manifested; that human nature is "capable" of deity, and that in its perfection God, who is not just human nature at its best, is adequately (so far as man is concerned) active and disclosed. The Logos theology, which Dr. Bethune-Baker appears to support, is of special value here. In one of his writings, he gives us a splendid statement along the lines here suggested: "Our Lord (is) the fullest expression of Divine Personality that is possible under the conditions of genuinely human life, the embodiment of God in man . . . the efficient cause of new relations between God and man, creating a new consciousness in man and new channels through which the power of God has since been operative in the world."

Dr. Bethune-Baker tells us that for him the belief in the Godhead of Christ means that when he knows Jesus he knows God. Occasionally he states this truth in somewhat extravagantly Christocentric terms, but elsewhere this is safeguarded. For him Our Lord never ceases to be man; but from Christ he learns of God as well as of man. "He becomes for me merged, as it were, in God, or identical with God." Our author is prepared to use the words of Baron von Hügel (in his address on *Christianity and the Supernatural*), in which Our Lord is seen as the implied "goal and centre" of all natural-supernatural experience, that one in whom there is as much of God as may be expressed in genuine human nature. So it is legitimate, indeed necessary, to adore Him as "God-Man." Dr. Bethune-Baker, it is clear, would subscribe whole-heartedly to Gwatkin's great assertion that Jesus Christ is one who is as divine as God and as human as any man. Less than that, we cannot rest content; more than that, Christian belief does not demand.

We feel that Dr. Bethune-Baker does not always see the danger in what amounts to equating God with the hypostatization of ideals and values, as when he says: "God stands to me for the highest values in life." von Hügel also subscribed to an incarnational philosophy, but for him God remained the transcendent Reality, prior to yet self-revealed in his creation but never exhausted therein. Again, his restatement seems weak (as we have indicated above) in its notion of prevenience. In a sense it is true that God-Man and Man-God are the same, but only in the sense that by the prevenient activity of God man is lifted into the unity with God, and not that humanity "achieves" deity through its own effort. That which is perhaps unfortunately called "the divine condescension" must be retained by any fundamentally Christian theology.

Once again, man's knowledge of God is not confined, as

on at least one occasion Dr. Bethune-Baker suggests (in his Girton Conference address), to the revelation in Christ. Broad-based Catholic theology must find God self-manifested through His whole universe, through all human history, but focally, definitively and supremely in Christ, who is thus the crown and criterion of all other revelation. And Dr. Bethune-Baker's own world-view would seem to preclude his adopting any narrower position.

A final criticism may be offered. While the Cambridge theologian is insistent that the Pauline affirmation that " the Son of God loved me and gave himself for me " is representative of a characteristic Christian note which must be retained in restatement, he seems occasionally to underestimate the soteriological emphasis in Christian thought. It is because Christ has been Saviour of men that we are interested in the problem of His person; only in so far as He has brought a new quality of life to men, and made them free of their sense of imperfection and their sin, is He understood to be divine. As a matter of sheer fact it is Christ who has made the parched ground a pool, and the thirsty ground a spring of water. That fact would give Him a quite special place in human history, on any reading.

In conclusion, we should acknowledge our indebtedness to Dr. Bethune-Baker's contribution to the restatement of the doctrine of Christ. In this paper we have made a number of criticisms, but that is only because we feel that the work which is criticized is of quite extraordinary value, and points the way for fruitful theological study. Especially important is the insistence on Christ's congruity with the whole process of evolution, and His significance as a clue to its nature. For (to use some words of Bishop Chandler) it is only when Christ " appears to us, not as an enigmatic figure suddenly protruded into the midst of a materialistic system . . . but as a figure which harmonizes with, and expresses, the true conceptive of Reality," that the full meaning of that concentrated redemptive act of God at one point in revelation-history is apprehended.

W. Norman Pittenger.

CHRISTIANITY AND MARXISM. CONFLICT IN TIME OR ETERNITY

We cannot yet expect any comprehensive apology of Christians in face of Marxists or the reverse. We are still too much in the heat of the first great encounter. There is, however, a

need to sketch more clearly certain aspects of the conflict and as far as possible in ordinary rather than highly philosophic terms. My present study mainly refers to England and it begins by dividing English Christians into two main sections, those who in face of Communism take their ground on Time, the others on Eternity. The former may be sub-divided into moderates and extremists. First, there are the various socially minded Christians who emphasize the Church's tradition of social and economic justice; the primitive koinonia, the medieval just price and condemnation of usury. They admit that modern capitalism swept the Church into an individualistic apostasy, but they take comfort in the last century's revival of an older tradition. Especially they encourage all modern practical movements, like slum clearance, which are founded on Christian principle. Such a social religion, they believe, will be the one bulwark against atheist Communism.

The extremists, on the other hand, are impatient with these Fabian tactics. In their view the apostasy must be remedied by a more sudden and violent recantation. Instinctively they wish to join the one movement which is in most thorough revolt against the old order. Such are the Christian Communists, first represented by the late Catholic Crusade of Conrad Noel. They wish to join the Communist movement and lead it on under Christian banners. The doctrinal credentials of the allies need not be examined too closely on either side; a pragmatic creed and fellowship of the battlefield will grow up between them.

Now both moderates and extremists, broadly speaking, take their stand on the ground of time. They are challenged by the tremendous conception of materially interpreted history which senses in the present age what might be called a proletarian fulness of time. The more emotional extremists want to cash in on this millennium with all the apocalyptic and prophetic resources which they can search out of the Bible. But the moderate social Christians are also concerned to make a good show of divine providence in time. They attempt to make religiously intentioned workers' flats in London keep some pace with the dialectical planning of Moscow.

These "time" apologists do not deny the more eternal aspect of their faith, but this belongs chiefly to their devotional lives. When they are faced with the practical rivalry of Marxism it is time which appears to them as the appropriate battleground.

The great weakness of this position is that Christianity from the Marxian point of view must have a poor record in time. According to Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr orthodox as opposed to

liberal Christianity has always tended to condone social injustice as a necessary consequence of the Fall. Personally I believe that a more useful distinction can be made between conservative and revolutionary elements both present in authentic Christianity. Even so it must be admitted that the conservative element is the most obvious when measured by the average historian's "course thumb." And today the slow-moving respectable conservatism of the Churches appears to outweigh any brave minority movements of rebellion. A modern Communist describes the Christian belief as a "distraction, a will-o'-the-wisp, a delusion to keep men from effectiveness. In moments of social crisis it is definitely reactionary and counter-revolutionary, a weapon in the hands of the anti-social forces."* And Christianity must appear like this to the mind of the complete Marxist with his furious concentration on a monist, human plane where the loud roar of material forces silences the still, small voice of personal values and the dumb action of the personal leaven.

Then there is the opposite section of Christians who take their ground on eternity. Their position may be summed up more quickly, but here again it is not artificial to note a division into moderates and extremists. The extremists are those who consciously exult in their belief that Christianity is far above the exigencies of time. They make the Barthian emphasis on the complete otherness of God. The moderates are those who in a lesser degree have the same confidence in the eternal and supernatural as providing adequate terms on which new converts to the faith may be admitted. These include perhaps a majority of sacramentalists who, although they claim that sacraments form the bridge from matter to spirit and from time to eternity, do not in fact go out of their way to concern themselves with the material and temporal base of their spiritual and eternal superstructure. Like the apologists in time they do not deny the other side, but their main practical energy is not in it. The weakness of any such head-in-the-air transcendentalism is obvious. It simply does not get across to the Communist whose feet are so firmly planted on the temporal ground of secular humanism. The Communist is heir to all the secular enthusiasm of the last two centuries from Rousseau onwards. He inherits the thoughts and feelings of the nineteenth-century scientists and the subjective romanticists as well as those of the socialists. Secular humanism is the most comprehensive term and all its devotees regard supernatural religion as an insidious, blood-sucking force, drawing precious energy from the humanist quest. For them religion gives a

* Ivan Levisky in *Christianity and the Social Revolution*, p. 295.

cheap and opiate compensation for the failures of human achievement, for our inadequate knowledge of the external world and for our inability to live full and satisfying lives on the personal or collective plane.

We have noted the two main sections of Christian thought and the obvious weaknesses of both. It must be recognized that the fulness of Christianity cannot be represented by a number of perfectly balanced individuals. It is stupidly complacent to disparage sincere extremists, the Christian agitator or lonely hermit, just because they represent only one side of the picture. But the licence which is given to a minority of effective extremists ought not to be extended to the far larger number who are narrow-minded and one-sided in a duller and less useful fashion. The urgent work of Christian apologetic against Marxism demands more many-track as opposed to single-track minds. These minds must not be absorbed in time nor triumphantly escaped into eternity. Their best energies must rather be spent in trying to bridge the gulf between time and eternity, while recognizing that this gulf can never be bridged entirely and that a tension exists which can never be entirely eased. For this purpose their interest in time must be many-sided and not merely economic. At least it must be no narrower than the old triad of ultimate values.

Τὸ δὲ *θεῖον καλόν, σοφόν, ἀγαθόν, καὶ πᾶν ὅ τι τοιοῦτον.**

So Plato, supreme spokesman of a humanist society, believed, and many of his countless followers down to the present day have vaguely felt that their dearest human values lead out towards some mysterious power which can best be named eternal and divine. *Omnia exeunt in mysterium.* The many-track minded Christian apologist must defend these two planes, the familiar and temporal as well as the mysterious and eternal. He must demonstrate that inevitable element of mystery in life which many only recognize in a vague and grudging fashion. He must shew that life cannot be tidied out and neatly filed and docketed in either humanist or religious phraseology. Neither the technical terms of theologians nor of Marxists can explain the double mystery of man and the universe, their nature and purpose.

The existence of a mystery cannot be proved by logic and yet there are certain ways of approach by which people are helped to realize how man though born in time is yet destined for an eternal order. The scope of this article only allows a brief mention of those approaches which seem to promise

* The divine is beauty, wisdom, goodness, and all such qualities (Phaedrus, 26).

most in the present apologetic field. First, we should recall the practical approach of the socially minded Christian which has been already discussed. An essential weakness of this approach was suggested but it has its obvious strength. It is too narrowly temporal and economically temporal at that, but when connected up with other roads its true power may be revealed and greatly increased. Then there are the specifically emotional ways of approach in the more sublime forms of art and in the best types of religious ceremonial. Conversely all stale and shoddy elements in Catholic or Protestant cultus work against the efforts of the Christian apologist. They convey an unintelligible mystification rather than an intelligible mystery and so they confirm the humanist's sneer.

Then there is the intellectual approach. This seems most hopeful along the lines of a Christian philosophy of history rather than pure theology, even when this is given a sociological aura. Contemporary historical interest is a remarkable fact. There is also a remarkable interest in a question which must closely touch any philosophy of history: the nature of time. A popular yet thoughtful curiosity is being aroused by J. W. Dunne's theory of time and Priestley's dramatic interpretation of it. Two recent books, F. H. Brabant's on *Time and Eternity* and M. F. Cleugh's philosophic treatise on *Time*, seem to shew which way the metaphysical wind is blowing. Christian thought is slow in supplying this new intellectual demand. The study of Church History is too academic and generates little vital philosophy. We still suffer from the early Church's disparagement of history and if we demand a philosophy for it we are too easily referred back to Augustine, the problems of whose age were similar to but not the same as ours.

The intellectual approach should also include the wide field of apologetics and concern with all those departments of modern thought which have so excited the humanist hopes. Here again the pace of Christian thought is too slow. Many slight books have accumulated, the hand-to-mouth efforts of apologists too deeply immersed in affairs. But there are very few thorough and scholarly works which also meet the humanist on his own ground at all its levels. Those few are largely neglected in the places where they should be most read, in theological faculties and colleges. Theological students are concerned with Clement, Aquinas and Butler, but often do not hear of Streeter's *Reality* or Barry's *The Relevance of Christianity*. And yet to be up to date is the *sine qua non* of apologetics.

These, then, are some of the main approaches by which the time-bound mind may be helped to gain some glimpses of

eternity. The work of developing these approaches is peculiarly suitable for English thinkers. For the recent œcumenical conferences at Oxford and Edinburgh made it apparent that the English churches form some sort of a bridge between the transcendentalism of the Continent and the humanistic liberalism which, however much challenged, still dominates American Christianity.

One last point should be made. It is that the Marxist is far more akin to the Christian than to his fellow dilettante humanists or to that large number who do not seriously concern themselves with religion or humanism, who are not deeply interested in either time or eternity. Clement of Alexandria, the first really successful Christian apologist, saw that Greek philosophy might act as a schoolmaster leading men to Christ. So it may be with the secular humanism of the Marxists. For they are moved by a strenuous and integrated enthusiasm for the potentialities of time, expecting it to fulfil the high purpose of a classless society and withering of the bourgeois state. As compared with those who waste their inheritance in time they display a spirit of divine discontent. It follows that they have the greater chance to acquire that loftier spirit of restlessness which claims inheritance of an eternal city.

E. Wykeham Edmonds.

THE KEY TO BIBLE-STUDY

As an outsider, I sometimes wonder whether the historians can appreciate the delight with which we accept their work. Part of that delight is akin to their own. As human beings, not to say as denizens of the earth, we are thrilled when the rubbish-heaps of the past are made to yield up their secrets, and some forgotten form of human life is brought back, to add another variation to the human theme. The more we know of human nature, especially as shewn against the background of strange conditions, the more do we realize the variety of our own possibilities. But we are not only attracted by the strangeness and wonder of this patient uncovering and piecing together of the past. We are even more attracted by the clearness which is thus given to voices whose meaning was almost incomprehensible to us, because we knew so little of what they implied. After all, human speech is a vast system of references, and when and where those references become obscure speech becomes dark and dubious. And this trouble

is apt to be aggravated by the substitution of new and illegitimate references. Context there must be, but there can be inappropriate contexts. Milton, for example, puts Biblical characters and ideas, of all ages, into the context of his own domestic and political troubles and thus accommodates their ideas to lines which distort them into grotesques. We are, therefore, under a great debt to those who have rescued us from an unhistorical outlook, and rediscovered for us the actual implications, and therefore the actual meaning, of the words, and the actual value of the observations of the canonical writers. Not until we know the exact phenomena with which they dealt can we avail ourselves of their analysis of life or their insight into their causes. Thanks to the scholars, we begin to know what the prophets, Jewish and Christians, are talking about. So, at last, we can apply their analysis and use their guidance in the study of life at first hand.

But here an important divergence of interest makes itself felt. The primary concern of many of us is with the understanding of life as it is. That is not the primary concern of the historian. It may be true that, as Croce asserts, the value, not to say the reality, of history depends on its relation to the present. But the historian, whether he labours in a library or in a trench, must guard against the intrusion of the present into the past. Otherwise he only produces another hybrid, and another muddle. He is engaged exclusively on the historical process. And we respect him for his devotion to it. But what is, to him, the primary interest of study, is, to many of us, secondary. We are trying to clear up the present, to understand the complex of spiritual forces which actuate the world as it is. We are grateful to him for clarifying the great generalizations which such men as Isaiah and Paul have bequeathed us. But we are interested in the works of these men, not for their own sakes, but because they help us to deal with that problem of the present which presses so hardly on us. Our imperative need is to make sense of the present. While, therefore, we welcome all the assistance of the historical school, our approach to the books of the canon is very different from theirs, if, indeed, it is not from the very opposite direction. There is no necessity for a conflict between us and them, or any controversy as to which is the better way. But there is danger of a misunderstanding, and, therefore, of a failure on our part to appreciate them, and on their part to appreciate our capacities—or it may be our want of capacity.

There are, in this country, two forms of culture, existing side by side, which may be inexactly but sufficiently styled the historical and the scientific. Their difference is not simply

the difference between professional scholars of the one kind and the other. A man may have forgotten his classics or his science, but the set which has been given to his mind remains. It is very difficult to explain the needs of the scientifically-educated to the historically-educated, but it must be done if the value of the work of the latter is not to be lost to a very large section of our nation, not to say our Church. As one who retains the attitude, though little of the knowledge, which a scientific education gives, let me try to bring out the difference. The would-be student of any science finds, in the text-book which is given to him, a statement of the science in its present form, enabling him to proceed at once to study the existing facts. He is not given, at the start, the steps by which the science has developed from its first gropings. He may come to this afterwards, but at the beginning he is given the clearest possible conception of the materials as they are now found. Indeed, in many cases he never troubles about the earlier stages of knowledge. He may find in some of his text-books cursory references to, or even brief paragraphs on, the stages by which the truth became evident. But these will not be the objects of his serious study, and, in any case, will not form the basis of his first studies. He will not be asked in studying Chemistry to begin from Alchemy, interesting and important as Alchemy was. Chemistry is a highly-developed science, but only lately has any serious or important study on the history of Chemistry been attempted. And even now it is regarded as a curiosity, and not as a necessary prelude to the study of the subject. Even in biology, though the theory of Evolution has made a great noise in the outside world, the student does not begin with the study of origins. He must first devote his attention to the books which deal with life as it is, and get a working knowledge of the present complex and condition of life, before he turns his attention to the stages through which it has passed. Indeed, he may never trouble himself much about the past history of life at all. A man may be quite a good biologist without being much of a palæontologist, though the reverse is not the case. And no one starts by being a palæontologist and then proceeds to become a biologist.

As long as a person regards Christianity as a more or less interesting relic of the past, he thinks it only natural that an account of the subject should be largely and, indeed, mainly, a study of origins. But when he discovers, as many are doing, that it is a living subject dealing with the spiritual world as it is, and takes up the Bible in the form in which he finds it, he is naturally rather bewildered. This slow historical method of approach is quite strange to him. If he attempts it, the

Pentateuch usually wears him out. For it gives at great length a method of approach to God through animal sacrifice a type of worship which he cannot follow, and whose apparatus has, in fact, disappeared. If he forces himself further he usually founders in the historical books. For it must be admitted that only the subsequent history of our religion can justify any study of the characters and incidents therein contained. Time after time, both with individuals and groups, I have encountered this failure and been asked, "What are we to make of it all?" By the sheer pressure of discomfited enquirers I have been forced to suggest an entirely different approach. If those of whom I speak were a small class, I should be content to mind my own business and what I may venture to call my own clients. But I know that the trouble is so wide-spread, that I feel impelled to speak more publicly.

I repeat that there is no cause to belittle the work of the Old Testament scholars. Still less is there any cause to decry the value of the intense and careful study of the Gospels, which, indeed, has in many ways been even more advantageous than the work done on the Old Testament. But even that has been allowed to become a stumbling-block. It is significant, though I have never seen it remarked, that all the really important attempts, from Strauss and Renan to Middleton Murry, to reduce the Gospels to essays in humanism have taken the form of "Lives of Jesus." The reason is evident. The whole problem of detecting Christ as He is, and the entire scope of the belief that He is a living Saviour, can be quietly shelved; He is thus shut into an epoch which is past. And the student of spiritual facts does not, and cannot, find it easy to make all the necessary transferences from that era to ours. Even if our Lord be regarded as a capable adviser, it is extremely difficult to apply advice given in so different an environment to the problems of our own day. But the difficulty caused by an exclusive attention to the Synoptics is not solely the difficulty of studying the twentieth century in the light of the first. Some of the main facts of the present situation were not in existence "in the days of His flesh." The Gospels treat chiefly of the days before He had died. They barely record His Resurrection. Their period precedes and stops short before the sending of the Holy Spirit. The vital facts of the spiritual life, as it now is, are Redemption, the gifts of the Spirit, and the various spiritual facts summed up under the title of the Body. These were not in existence or, at least, had barely begun to be, till after the point at which the Gospels conclude.

The books which deal with the life in which we find ourselves

are the Epistles. They are our handbook to the facts as they are now. And anyone who wishes to understand the present situation, and to deal in safety with the forces now in action, must put them in the foreground. Indeed, as one studies them, he sometimes wonders whether, in a sense, they ought not to be regarded as almost superseding the Gospels—or at least the Synoptic Gospels. It is certainly notable that the balance of teaching in the Epistles is very different from the balance which is struck nowadays. We regard the "Gospel" incidents as primary, while they scarcely refer to them. St. Paul indeed seems to relegate them to the past, with his "Henceforward know we Him no more after the flesh." I cannot think that St. Paul would regard any details of Christ's life on earth as not deserving, or indeed demanding, study. But I cannot but feel that he was aware of the danger of shutting Him into the Palestine of the first century and cutting off all view of His subsequent position and activities.* However that may be, the position which St. Paul grasped with increasing clearness is that of life in Christ. And that is very different from anything portrayed in the Gospels, despite the efforts of the fourth Gospel to bridge the gap. For, precedent to His death and resurrection, Jesus was a figure apart, bound no doubt by close ties of affection not only to his close followers but to a far wider circle, but nevertheless separate from them. St. Paul found Him, not separate but inclusive. That is how Christ is now.

Still, on the whole, the epistles are rather of the nature of occasional papers than of systematic descriptions, although they cover a surprising amount of the ground. At the same time, they are full of quotations, which are more than quotations but rather references. These are meant to throw readers back on the writings of the prophets, and certainly imply a knowledge of them. Some knowledge of the prophets, therefore, is necessary. It has been thought that the early Christians had a collection of Messianic passages to put into the hands of converts, and even enquirers. If so, it is regrettable that it has been lost and never officially reconstructed, especially as our Lord immediately after His Resurrection turned the attention of His followers to the prophecies of the Suffering Servant. But even as it is, we can direct attention to Second Isaiah as giving this teaching as its climax. In doing so, we are not reversing the policy which we have suggested. For

* The Archbishop of York has said lately: "I am quite sure that a great deal of our religious instruction has given many people the impression that God was very active in one part of the world and at one time—namely in Palestine—but that He has never been anywhere else or done anything much since."

the value of such writers as Isaiah is, not that they predicted Christ, but that they beheld Him, and beheld Him, not pent into a few years and a tiny country, but extending over ages. It can, therefore, be legitimately said that they draw attention to Him as He is, as a universal and not a local figure. He is seen in their works as the dominant element in the spiritual world. To this system of thought and perception we are referred by the Epistles themselves, and, indeed, also by the Gospels, by their system of constant reference. It has fortunately been kept before the minds of many, who might otherwise have lost it, by the excellent collection of passages in Handel's "Messiah," especially in the North, where that Oratorio is almost a household word. The words of that great work, not to mention the majestic commentary of its music, have acted as a corrective to popular hymns which distorted the prophetic teaching. Now it has outlived them, and still continues its work. But if we are to regain the vision of the Universal Atoner, it seems imperative that the prophets and especially Second Isaiah be brought into the foreground and studied intensively, at least in part.

I have been driven, in the actual course of helping people back to the Bible, to a course which runs counter to modern scholastic tradition, with Isaiah II. and not the Pentateuch as the beginning, followed by St. Mark and then the Epistles (primarily Ephesians). After that the rest can be tackled intelligently, if the student be persistent enough. After all, the tradition to which I refer is quite modern and has generally been either a pious hope or a distant ideal. Those of us whose memories go back to the old Bible-reading days will recollect how thumbed and worn were the pages of Isaiah, compared with the rest of the Old Testament. And those who remember the humble but powerful preachers of conversion and redemption, who were the glory of Nonconformity, know how their preaching was crammed with the thought and redolent of the very language of Isaiah.

Under the pressure of present-day needs, many of us who are in contact with those who are on the borderland of the Christian faith, ardently desire that a new type of Introduction to the Bible would be produced by someone who is qualified for the task. But in the meantime the teaching which we have to give in church reaches many who do not study and would not face the labour of working through a text-book. Here it is possible and, indeed, simple to find and devote time to drawing attention to those vital but neglected parts of the Bible, the Prophets and the Epistles. Here it is possible to make clear which are the salient passages, and to teach people to think along their lines. The cry of the Ethiopian, "How can I

understand what I read except some man shall guide me?" expresses the shy desire of many of our people. The growing practice of accompanying the reading of the lessons in church with a few words of explanation and commentary is an excellent response to this desire. Such guidance to the understanding of the Scriptures is most gratefully received. It needs careful planning and needs, too, the recognition that very elementary teaching is needed, even by educated congregations, but it provides an open road to that intelligent reading of the Bible which, fortunately, so many are anxious to attain.

R. O. P. Taylor.

MISCELLANEA

GROUPING OF PARISHES

This has been in the writer's mind for many years because he began his ministry in what may rightly be termed a group of parishes: a town with several thousands of inhabitants, and on one side, two miles off, a pit village of 500 with its own little church; on another side, two to three miles distant, a second pit village of 2,000 souls with its own larger church; in yet another direction, some 600 miners and their families with their small church; in the centre of the town a modern church, and a little more than a mile off, the large old parish church, with 1,200 people around it.

These five churches were served by a staff of a vicar with four assistants. Besides the vicar, one assistant was married and lived by his church. The others (unmarried) lodged in the town, but might well have been housed in the pit villages had there been need.

Some of the clergy who served the outlying pit villages had a portion of the town allotted to them for pastoral care, in addition to the village and church which each served, and where he was known as " our Curate."

The clergy met each Monday for various purposes, but especially to allot the services of the next Sunday, so that each took one service or more in his own church, and one service in another: so that, as a rule, he delivered one sermon on a Sunday in two different churches. Thus each member of the staff was known to each of the five congregations, though each, as has been said, was " our Curate " in the eyes of the people of his own district.

The distances were covered by pedal cycles, except in one case where the steep banks made walking necessary. Today motors make such distances almost negligible.

Let it be added that in the town there was another parish with its vicar and assistant, and those of the staff of five always, perhaps in boyish fashion, commiserated that parish and its clergy for their isolation.

Possible Drawbacks to such Grouping in the Case of Country Parishes

First the novelty of it.

1. In the case of the parish which I have described the outlying pit villages were of comparatively modern growth. As the mines were opened and the miners' houses grew, in various parts of the extensive parish area, first one and then another pit village was served by clergy attached to the mother church. So the grouping was a natural growth; but no desire for separation was apparent.

2. It might deprive the village of the residence in its midst of the priest in charge. Yet this need not be in all cases. He might continue to occupy the parsonage, and if married probably would.

3. The loss of independence to the clergy, when, instead of three or

four incumbents each independent and ensconced in his parson's freehold, there would be one vicar or rector with two or more assistant clergy.

To the writer this seems to have little weight, because so far from being a drawback, it would be a splendid example of brotherhood and co-operation given by those whose very duty it is to give it: and also because as followers of our Lord we ought to be the first to seek not the chief seats but the lower. In this regard the grouping which is in mind would accord with great Christian principles.

It would require that the vicar should be a wise man, and each curate allowed much liberty in the conduct of worship in the church assigned to his own special care, and when others of the staff served there they should follow the customary use.

4. Patronage. This may present serious difficulties where, as will mostly be the case, the Patrons of the parishes are different. But the difficulty of securing good incumbents for small parishes is serious, and seems to be increasing: and it may be hoped that where the grouping were approved by the Diocesan, not all Patrons would be obstinate.

The Benefits of such Grouping

First, from the point of view of the Clergy.

1. It banishes, or at least relieves, the isolation of the parish priest. He works in close fellowship with brethren. His life and interests are no longer confined to a small area or a tiny flock. He has fewer sermons to prepare, and more incentive to prepare them carefully, because they will be heard by more people. In some cases he may hear others preach more often than when working in isolation. Certainly the weekly staff meeting would be invaluable in its opportunities for exchange of ideas: the priest would be kept fresher, and his people would feel the benefit. So isolation banished or reduced, brotherhood between the clergy and freshness in them would be promoted.

2. In some cases the number of clergy required might be lessened; though I do not count this among the chief objects of the proposal.

3. To many it will seem that the opportunity so given for wise leadership of a team of clergy would be a gain to the Church, in developing latent powers of such leadership, as well as in fostering fellowship in service.

4. Special gifts would find a wider field and be called into complementary co-operation. For A with his talent for adult religious instruction, or B with his dramatic gift, or C with his special musical powers, would naturally employ his talent not in his own district only but in others of the group of parishes.

5. Some capable younger clergy, who at present fight shy of a small country living, or are reluctantly compelled by circumstances to accept one, would not have so great cause to hesitate, and would be saved from the temptations which small country parishes at present offer.

6. The disparity between the number of the people served by the clergy would be lessened wherever a priest in charge of a small parish had the pastoral care of a portion of a neighbouring larger one assigned to him, as would happen where a populous parish was grouped with one or two of small size.

The Benefits from the Point of View of the Congregation

Before long they would see new freshness and life in the priest in whose special care they were; they would see other clergy closely co-operating with him; they would hear new voices, and be in touch with fresh minds. And, further, the fact that the clergy who served them and were thus known to them served also other congregations, while forming one staff or "College" of clergy, would tend to evoke the right church spirit, and lower, or even, let us hope, break down the barrier which so often separates one parish from another. Narrow parochialism both in clergy and laity would certainly be more easily attacked, in proportion as the grouping helped to free the clergy themselves from it.

The writer would not advocate an attempt to introduce such a system as this on a large scale. He would certainly rejoice to see some experiments in it made where circumstances allowed—unless some insuperable drawbacks, which have escaped his notice, are found to be inherent in and ineradicable from the proposal. It seems, however, to deserve careful consideration.

Finally, the centre of this proposal will be given its due prominence, if we call it not the grouping of parishes, but the grouping of parochial clergy.

And the method need not be that of permanent union of benefices, but of benefices held in plurality.

But if such grouping is found on further examination to be in accord with Christian principles, as indeed I think it is, then we are bound to work for it with all our power.

Arthur M. Knight, *Bishop.*

THE EASTER MESSAGE IN ST. MARK'S GOSPEL

We hear so much about the supposedly lost ending of St. Mark that we are apt to overlook what actually is said in the existing fragment of the Easter story. The central point of this is in chapter xvi. verse 6, where the "young man" says to the women: "Do not be frightened; it is Jesus you are looking for, the Nazarene who has been crucified. He has risen, He is not here. Look, there is the place where they laid Him." The position of "the Nazarene" is emphatic, and suggests that it is something more than a mere patronymic. It is not St. Mark's way to explain his scripture references, though, as Hoskyn's and Davey's *Riddle of the New Testament* has shewn us, his gospel is packed full of them. It seems that we have the key to the use of "the Nazarene" here in an earlier passage, namely x. 47. Here we read of the blind man outside Jericho that "when he heard that it was Jesus *the Nazarene*, he began to call out and to say, '*Son of David*, Jesus, have mercy on me.' Matt. ii. 22 and 23 shews that the second generation of Christians at any rate regarded our Lord's connection with Nazareth as a fulfilment of prophecy; and tradition from the time of Jerome onwards took it that the prophecy in question was that of the *nēçer* or Branch from the roots of Jesse in Isa. ii. This has been much disputed in recent times; but no better solution has been put forward and the passages before us give reason for

thinking that the linking of Nazareth and *nēçer* is not only what Matthew meant but runs back on our Lord's own lifetime. The point of the prophecy is the unexpectedness of a vigorous shoot and fruitful branch out of the apparently effete stock of the royal house; and Nathanael's words in John i. 46 make it clear that the advent of the Messiah from unlikely Nazareth was equally surprising. The Jews loved to play on words, as the Old Testament abundantly testifies, and knowing nothing of the science of language as we understand it were as content with an assonance, which is probably all that exists here, as with a true relation. It would therefore be quite natural for a blind man, hearing the great Healer with the saving name described as "the Nazarene," to connect him with the *nēçer* from the roots of Jesse and so appeal to Him as "Son of David." Moreover, and this is the important thing here, whatever the popular associations of the title may have been, this prophecy taken as a whole emphasizes precisely those features of the Messianic King which he shares with the Suffering Servant. Not only is the Spirit of the Lord upon them both and their vocational work described in closely similar terms (*cp.* Isa. xlii. 1-3 with xi. 2, and xlii. 3-9, xlix. 5-9, and liii. 10-12 with xi. 3-9), but it said of the Servant in liii. 2 that "he shall grow up . . . like a sucker (*yôneq*) out of parched ground." This is a figure almost identical with that of the *nēçer*, though differently applied, for whereas the latter has reference only to the origin of the Davidic king, the former summarizes the whole rhythm of the Servant's life, with emphasis on his exaltation out of humiliation and the apparent finality of death. Both passages must surely have been among those from which the Lord Himself expounded first to the two disciples and then to the apostles also "the things concerning Himself." (Luke xxiv. 25-27 and 44-46); and they are close enough in thought for the name Nazarene to recall them both. So Mark xvi. 6 is as much as to say "The *Nazarene* has done that which is written of the *nēçer* and the *yôneq*, and risen up alive out of death." The figure is as forcible as it is simple, and if Mark is echoing Peter who heard both the blind man's cry and the Lord's own discourse on the very day of His Resurrection, it comes to us with singular directness.

A MEMBER OF C.S.M.V.

THE DOCTRINAL COMMISSION AND THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE

SIXTY-FIVE years ago a petition was presented to Convocation asking that "in view of the widespread and increasing use of sacramental confession measures should be taken for the provision of duly qualified confessors."

The great Evangelical, Lord Shaftesbury, at a meeting in Exeter Hall, denounced it as "this most preposterous, this most hateful proposition."

His language was gently rebuked by Archbishop Tait as immoderate, but it represented the general feeling of Englishmen at the time.

Today the Archbishops' Commission, representing all schools of thought, states in almost the same words as the petition of 1873 that there is a widespread and increasing desire on the part of individuals to avail themselves of this direct and private ministry.

It goes further. "The regular practice of auricular confession has

now become more frequent, and is by no means confined to one school of thought in the Church of England."

Here indeed is proof, if proof were needed, of reconciliation and agreement of parties in the Church.

The Bishops in 1873 in their reply to the petitioners interpreted Article XXV as disowning the Sacrament of Penance. "The Church of England knows no such words as Sacramental Confession."

But the Doctrinal Commission, though it uses the term "Sacrament of Penance" only in connection with scholastic theology, plainly recognizes the sacramental aspect of private confession and absolution, and mentions the imposition of a penance as a customary practice.

If not precisely in words, yet in fact, we have here a recognition by representatives of all parties that the provision in the Book of Common Prayer for the reconciliation of individuals is identical with the Sacrament of Penance, one of those "commonly called Sacraments," and that it has a place in the spiritual life of the Church of England.

This is definite enough; but there is one passage in the report of which the meaning is at first obscure. "The experience of our own time . . . testifies to a widespread need for confession not only to God but to man."

Is the widespread need to be regarded objectively or subjectively? Does the experience of our own time testify that many who do not use confession to man (and this must include the use of the Sacrament of Penance) need to do so for their spiritual well-being? Or is the experience limited to those who in increasing numbers have discovered their need and use it?

The former interpretation would seem to commit the members of the commission to a dogmatic statement that many ought to use private confession, and take them further than their own interpretation of the Prayer Book teaching on the Sacrament of Penance. "Our own Church has expressly advised" are the words used to explain "Let him come unto me or to some other discreet and learned minister." And later the report states: "It is important to recognize that it is a ministry of the word open to all but obligatory on none."

We must assume therefore that the latter meaning is correct, and that the widespread need is testified by the "individuals who avail themselves of this direct and private ministry."

But it is questionable whether the commission has given the right sense to the crucial words of the exhortation "let him come."

Dr. N. P. Williams, in an article in the *Church Times*, interprets the above opinion as agreeing with the maxim "None must, all may, some should."

But there is a difference. "Some should" implies obligation for some; the report says: "it is obligatory upon none."

The maxim thus interprets "let him come" in an obligatory sense, the report in an advisory sense; by a casual reader the phrase has been taken in a permissive sense; and this is probably the popular attitude.

Did the framers of the Book of Common Prayer deliberately leave the meaning vague, to be interpreted by different parties according to their liking? Or is a precise meaning to be attached to the words? The context should supply the answer.

The exhortation for the most part uses the second person: "ye shall reconcile," "repent you of your sins" "come not to that holy Table."

These phrases are certainly not permissive in sense; and, coupled as

they are with the solemn warning of the danger of making a communion in a state of impenitence, have much more than an advisory character. The last expression is much nearer to "you ought not to come" than to "I advise you not to come."

Clearly then the phrases in the second person are obligatory in sense. Can the change from the second person to the third be said to weaken this obligatory sense, so that what was before imperative now becomes "express advice"?

The natural way to interpret the third person is to take it in the same sense as the second. Whatever the tone of the exhortation is, whether command or monition, it should be regarded as the same throughout; and if the second person strikes an obligatory note, then the third must do so also.

The change of person is easily explained by the fact that in the last paragraph there is a change from the general to the particular; the individual who cannot quiet his conscience is singled out from the congregation, and this involves the use of the third person.

Indeed, the fact that he is singled out seems to emphasise the note of obligation.

A reference to some non-English versions of the Prayer Book does not support a monitory sense.

The Greek of Duport, Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge (1665), has ἐλθέτω for "let him come"—a clear imperative.

In the *Liturgia Anglicana Octoglotta*, edited by Bagster (1821), there is a peremptory note in the German *komme der*, the Italian *venga da me*, the Spanish *venga á mi*, the French *qu'il s'addresse*; and the conjunctives of the modern Greek version, ἔλθῃ πρὸς μὲ, and the Latin (from Bowyer, 1720), *ad me accedat*, would naturally be taken as jussive in sense; so, too, *ad me se conferat . . . et dolorem detegat* in Bright and Medd's version.

At the Savoy Conference, in reply to the exceptions against the Communion Office, and particularly to the direction in the exhortation that people should come with a quiet conscience, as likely to deter many, the Bishops take the view that the exhortation "prescribes" means for quieting the conscience.

Evidently, then, they thought it well that people should be deterred until they had obeyed the injunction of the Church by taking the wholesome medicine of her prescription.

The sense of religious obligation at the present time is weak enough, and it is to be regretted that the report should be so emphatic in its insistence that the sacrament of penance is obligatory on none, and make the Church's teaching in the Book of Common Prayer more indefinite than it really is.

C. A. Weeks.

NOT THITHER REUNION

The article entitled "Whither Reunion?" published in the December issue of Theology, is one which should be read and pondered, because it represents a phase of the religious thought of our day. The article is interesting both because of its contents and because of its omissions; and in what follows both of these will be subjects of discussion.

(1) The author writes: "To many sincere people it does not matter

whether reunion is to make Christianity more High Church or more Low Church, more Hellenistic or more Hebraistic, so long as more unity is attained. Such a reunion, however, would be shallow. Tolerance must not be confused with indifference." These are admirable sentiments. Merely to reach some formula of reunion, which leaves everything else exactly as it is, is rightly the object of this criticism. But consideration of the writer's proposed scheme of reunion leaves the reader somewhat amazed. There is suggested a device, a hierarchy of "rites," whose effect is to give an appearance of unity, leaving everything else exactly as it is. One is tempted to say that the difference between such "tolerance" and the "indifference" criticized above is so small as to be indistinguishable.

In effect (despite the suggestion contained in the final quotation from 1 Cor. xii.) the unity proposed is really one of aggregation. Such a unity is found, say, in a chess club. In this individuals, whose lives and personalities are complete, band themselves together in a form of unity because they have an interest in common. But, should a member for any reason resign from the club, there is no real alteration in himself. Apparently this is the kind of unity envisaged in the scheme, for it is said that the Church of the future "must be capable of absorbing within itself all shades of religious thought and degrees of development." It is hard to think of St. Paul sharing this view when he wrote to the Galatians.

Against this can be set another conception, that of organic unity. This is analogous to the objective unity of—*e.g.*, a family. This does not exclude variety, but there is inevitably a sharing of physical, mental and spiritual reality. There may even be divisions, but they cannot obliterate the fact that the members of the family are of one blood.

Those who think of this kind of unity as belonging to the Church are concerned to know whether any party to a proposed reunion possesses the actual principles of the Church's life—*e.g.*: (*a*) An acknowledgment that our religion is based on certain actual facts, not on "all shades of religious thought," but on creeds and scriptures; (*b*) the recognition that all men have certain spiritual needs, and that they should use God-given ways of meeting these needs, called Sacraments; (*c*) that there is a reality of continuity and authorization which can be recognized historically, so that men may be assured that the acts of the Church are all Christ meant them to be.

Given some such underlying principle, the varied transactions originated by the Lambeth Conferences become an intelligible whole. It makes consistent the approach to the Old Catholics and to the Orthodox, the dealings with the Church of Sweden, the Malines conversations, and what has occurred with the non-episcopal bodies. This is mentioned to shew that, while others might not use the present writer's words, belief in a unity, deeper than that of mere aggregation, is widely held.

Finally, if the line of thought which has been suggested is valid, this organic unity actually exists, despite superficial divisions, just as Israel and Judah, though (politically) divided, both constituted the covenanted instrument of God, for the organic (racial) unity was there.

(2) A second topic for discussion may begin with this quotation from the article, "We have to deal with people who think ministers need not be educated and therefore need not be paid. We have to deal with people who press for even greater scholarship. Some cry for more

negro spirituals within the church, while others yearn for more Gregorian chants." Again the qualities of the Church of England and the Church of Scotland are referred to thus: "Both are national Churches, established by law. Both strive after a scholarly ministry. Differences in ritual do not now mean what they did yesterday, and differences in ecclesiastical government might be gracefully united in one system." This is very naïve. We look in vain for any reference to the vital question of *order*. All that is dealt with is external and non-essential. Within our own communion we have many such differences. Music and ceremonial vary. So does ritual. There are infinite grades of scholarship, and differences of jurisdiction. The fact of "establishment" is a mere accident of history, and it is significant that the "established" Church of England is in communion, not with the "established" Church of Scotland, but with the disestablished Episcopal Church. These differences are permitted in our communion just because they are trivial and non-essential. What really determines action are such matters as Order, Faith and Sacrament.

Akin to the above suggestions of the writer of the article is his contention that "to be powerful" the Church of the future "must have some degree of national support." Well, one wonders. There are different kinds of power. The Church has in the past wielded political power, and military power, and the power of wealth. But its *spiritual* power was greatest when Christians were "hated of all nations." The work of the Church in the first three centuries was, after the Cross, the most spectacular vindication of the spiritual power of those who were weak in the worldly sense. Perhaps we should look to those days for our lesson, rather than cultivate "national support."

(3) Again we quote: "The only body of any numerical importance which we cannot *and need not* (italics are mine—P. C. L.) encounter in our scheme is the Church of Rome." The writer of the article details some of the difficulties—enormous difficulties—which beset the hope that there may be a reunion of all Christendom. But are the difficulties presented by Rome, though different in kind, to be regarded as insuperable any more than those presented by intransigeant protestantism? He is a rash man who will say confidently that either is greater than the other. Rather, despite difficulties, of which we can at present see no way of resolution, we remind ourselves with the Bishops at Lambeth of "the fact that there can be no fulfilment of the Divine purpose in any scheme of reunion which does not ultimately include the great Latin Church of the West."

Indeed, the scheme proposed in "Whither Reunion?" is a counsel of despair. "These Churches could unite in a League of Churches . . . the ecclesiastical institution of Rome would be outside this League." This cynical exclusion of a great and important part of Christendom from even an "ultimate" place in the re-united Church would give, not Christian unity, but Christian duality. Perhaps the best answer to this comes from the writer's own final quotation, "the eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee."

P. C. Lempriere.

ST. JOHN VI. AND THE QUESTION OF THE AUTHOR

In the study of a small part of the vast bibliography of this subject, one or two points seem to emerge as shedding light upon the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. They are:

(1) The language in which it was originally written and the difference of style noted between the strongly Aramaic tone and construction of the sayings and that of the narrative, which is much less so.

(2) The question of the use of Mark by the writer of this gospel as we have it, in regard to which John vi. is the most important passage.

For the sake of clearness I have put two possible conclusions first, then the evidence on which they are based and the reasons for rejecting the first, and the grounds on which in my view the second may be held to be a good possibility. Neither of these claims to be at all new or original, but it has seemed to me that some of the points made by several different scholars shed much light when compared and fitted together.

(*a*) The view held by Dr. Burney* that the evangelist wrote his own recollections in Aramaic, possibly supplementing them from information gained from other hearers on occasions when he was not present himself. This Aramaic account was afterwards translated into Greek by another hand.

(*b*) That the gospel is not a translation from written Aramaic, but the style strongly indicates a writer who thought in Aramaic and then translated into Greek.

In relation to either of these is the view held by Burney that the gospel tells mainly of events in Jerusalem and Judæa, because the writer was not the Apostle John but a Rabbinically trained Jew who heard the Master whenever He was in Jerusalem or its neighbourhood. That he was too young to be allowed to become a full disciple and thus did not go with Jesus and the others to Galilee, therefore the Galilean incidents must come at secondhand whether from a written source, or, as Burney thought probable, from one of the apostles.

Evidence on the Language.—Dr. Burney found many instances of mistranslations in the Greek of the Aramaic phrases which lay behind them, and believed they were due to the use of a written Aramaic source. Professor Torrey did not agree with most of these although he did support the general theory of a translation from written Aramaic. This view seems, however, to break down for reasons connected also with (2) above.

Evidence on the use of Mark.—Bishop Bernard† and Dr. Streeter‡ both noted a large number of passages, mainly, though not only, in John vi. which resemble the parallel in Mark vi. so closely as to force the conclusion that the writer is using Mark as a basis. Streeter tried to reconcile this with Burney's theory by supposing that both writers give an independent translation of a common Aramaic original. But there are differences as well as likenesses, and he submitted those in chapter 6 to an Aramaic scholar who said that they could not be due to variant translations of the same words. Also Burney did not think that Mark's Aramaic style was due to translation from written Aramaic. Thus conclusion (*a*) seems to be ruled out, and we have to consider whether (*b*) is possible in view of this

* Burney, *Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel.*
† Bernard, *International Critical Commentary*, St. John.
‡ Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 1928.

fact, if fact it be, of the use of Mark by the writer of our Fourth Gospel. As most of the instances given by Bernard and Streeter are in chapter 6 we must turn to that first.

(*b*) Chapter 6 is the only one, except chapter 4, dealing with events not in Judæa, and it is striking to notice that Professor Stanton,* who regarded the author as not an eyewitness, and was writing before Burney, cites this very chapter as his chief evidence for that view. Dr. Howard† remarks that Stanton has here quite independently reached the main idea of Form-Criticism when he says that the discourse of John vi. is placed where it is because the writer, or preacher, "was accustomed to use the miracle in his instruction of Christian assemblies as a text for setting forth Jesus as the Living Bread." Bernard also regards the discourse of this chapter as out of its historical context.

But is it not possible that the author might wish to supplement his own recollections in this one instance because he had often used the Feeding of the Five Thousand as a text for the teaching of Christ about Himself as the Living Bread? It would be quite natural to use St. Mark's account of the miracle though adding and altering as to points that he was told about when next the disciples came to Jerusalem. We have also to reckon with the fact that many scholars see likenesses in other parts of the Fourth Gospel to that of St. Mark. The most important perhaps is that in John v. 8, where the use of the word κραββατος is supposed to be so colloquial that it must be dependent on Mark ii. 4, 11. It is thought very unlikely that the two writers would independently choose it to translate the original Aramaic used by our Lord in the two incidents described (and in the narrative in Mark). But Moulton and Milligan‡ do not appear to regard it as a vulgarism, for they say that as the poor man's bed it is a suitable word in Mark.

The other examples are all in sayings of Christ, and Streeter himself says that they can be explained by the view that these sayings have come down to us in more accurate form than has usually been supposed. It is true that he regards this as not incompatible with the explanation that he prefers, namely, that the author belonged to that order of prophets mentioned in Acts and early Christian writers so that the discourses came to him "in the spirit"; and the gospel naturally reflected his native Aramaic. I think that most people would be content with the first and simpler explanation.

Another point arises in consideration of this use of Mark. Bernard, Streeter and Stanton all to some extent regard the writer as a disciple of the Apostle John, a younger man who may perhaps have seen and heard the Lord in his youth, but who as a whole gives us a second-hand report. Now if so then this gospel comes to us in exactly the same way as the second gospel is usually believed to do, both writers giving us the recollections and preaching of apostles. If so then one would expect to find the same features in both, whereas they appear to differ in one important point. S. R. Driver§ finds in the Fourth Gospel a very much more marked Aramaic style in the sayings than in the narrative, and Burney's instances of mistranslated Aramaic are all from the sayings. But I do not think that such a difference has been noted in Mark. If

* Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, 1920.
† *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation.*
‡ *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament.*
§ *Jewish Guardian*, Jan. 5 and 12, 1923.

not then it appears to be a strong point in favour of a first-hand author of St. John.

The view of Form-Criticism that we have not to look to any one apostle or individual but only to the tradition of churches, is too large to discuss here. But I do feel that Burney's other theories have not received the attention that they deserve because his primary one of a translation from written Aramaic has been rejected. In particular his thorough investigation of Irenæus' use of the terms "apostle" and "disciple" has been strangely neglected, to the best of my knowledge. This is surprising since the theory that a disciple of the apostle wrote the gospel rather than an eye-witness not an apostle, depends largely on the idea that one of the Twelve alone could have been present at the Last Supper. Even Bishop Bernard dismisses the idea of the Johannine tradition having referred originally to the Elder John on the ground that Irenæus could not have made such a mistake. He ignores Burney's contention that he was not mistaken but that everybody else has mistaken him. There does seem to be a case for more consideration for Burney's hypothesis of a young man, not of the Twelve, but intellectually able to follow our Lord's talk and controversies with the Pharisees in Jerusalem as they could not and therefore forgot them. He believes him to have been present at the Last Supper and makes the interesting suggestion that it was his presence which gave rise to the quarrel about precedence told of in Luke xxii. and hinted at in John xiii. If the writer was the cause of that dispute it would be natural for him not to describe it. Also the words in Luke xxii., 26, γενέσθω ὡς ο νεώτερος, would have much point if this young man was reclining beside the Lord when they were spoken.

DELIA LYTTELTON.

PASTORALIA

PASTORAL theology for modern times, like the Catholic Faith, does not necessarily involve the scrapping of all that the experience and reflection of past generations have taught us. But while it may restate some old principles in modern conceptions or apply them to new conditions, pastoral theology in the twentieth century may do much by simply restating some principles or practices which, though well known in times less conceited than our own "scientific" age, have not yet been recovered to any general extent.

In any case, pastoral theology is always worth the writing and the reading if it does but re-emphasize its fundamental principles in the light of modern conditions of life and the problems involved therein. The foregoing seems to the writer to afford a slight justification for presuming to offer a few considerations.

Sound doctrine (or dogmatic theology) must always form the foundation of any true Christian life, and also, *a fortiori*, the foundation of a priest's life. Since a priest is solemnly entrusted with the work of shepherding souls, he needs to have some knowledge of pastoral theology. This branch of theology, apart from moral theology, considers the general work of the priest in relation to (*a*) the faithful, (*b*) the unfaithful and (*c*) the faithless.

But between his dogmatic and his pastoral theology, it cannot be too strongly emphasized, there should come ascetic theology.

Probably every good book on pastoral theology gives a chapter to ascetic theology or the priest's personal life. But because we priests are all sons of Adam and also are encouraged by the unscientific thinking of our " scientific " age, we are prone very often to deal in abstractions. The analytical spirit is so prevalent and so much value is attached to " works " that we tend to seize hold of *methods*, which pastoral theology may suggest, and forget that they are abstractions unless bound up with the *priestly life* which they presuppose.

Just as a true Christian life cannot be lived without a sound dogmatic basis, so too a priest's application of pastoral theology will be futile without the application of ascetic theology in his own life.

It is useless for a priest to search every available volume on pastoral theology for methods and hints if he is not first seriously setting his own house in order by cultivating the interior life. Nothing whatsoever can justify him in such neglect of what is his obvious and also his vowed obligation. Without the practice of diligent reading of the Scriptures, or meditation, a " pastor's " study of pastoral theology is but an effort to salve his conscience for starving his faith, by being zealous for dead works.

The practice of the principles of ascetic theology may most conveniently be summed up in the term " recollection," and this can give us a vivid and concrete link between our ascetic and our pastoral theology. For by the practice of recollection we bring to the methods and principles of pastoral theology the spirit which makes all the difference between a *knowledgeable parson* and a *man of God.*

Recollection would seem to give the key to every aspect of pastoral work—but let us reiterate that regular meditation is the root from which it springs and sustains itself. We would do well to note that recollection can neither be attained immediately nor absolutely: it requires painful effort and constant renewal of such effort after repeated failures. To know this is to forestall discouragement.

Taking recollection as the crystallization of ascetic theology, and understanding it as being mindful of " Christ dwelling in me " (or as the Practice of the Presence of God, or in terms of St. Patrick's Breastplate, " Christ beside me," etc.) let us link it with a few aspects of pastoral work.

But first we might consider the priest himself. To be recollected without having a definite purpose or aim, would certainly " get one nowhere." He must be clear and definite in his own mind as to what priesthood means and whether he means to try to attain to its true meaning.

The true meaning of priesthood cannot be less than its highest, so that priesthood should be regarded as something so great in privilege, dignity and responsibility as to absorb all a man's interest and enthusiasm (" apply yourselves *wholly* to this one thing, and draw *all* your cares and studies this way "). If this is so with a priest, then it is most fitting that he visit his flock wearing his cassock. For not only is it a reminder to himself of what he is by ordination and of Whose business he is about, but it is also a reminder and a symbol to his people that religion is so great and grand a thing, and his care for their souls so real, that he is willing to be " set apart " wholly for this work of God—to the exclusion of any private interest or claim.

While there are many factors which bear upon the general apathy of

our fellow men and women towards the Catholic religion, the one which is perhaps most distasteful to us is the adulterated Christianity which we clergy seem to be content with, both for ourselves and our people.

It would appear that we require a new ideal of priesthood, or rather, not a new ideal but a recovery of something of an old ideal. As in philosophy, many are turning back to Thomas Aquinas, so perhaps in religion a turning back to the best ideals of the Middle Ages may bring to the Anglican Communion an old ideal of priesthood made new. This consideration of the definite and absorbing purpose which should dominate a priest's life has a direct bearing on the problem of seeking for those sheep which are astray—the great number of uninstructed and indifferent. These souls, so dear to our Lord, make us stand aghast by their numbers, their indifference and particularly their inaccessibility to an already over-busy priest.

Many zealous priests feel they must do something for these masses by deliberately seeking to attract them to some kind of " sugary " gathering such as a P.S.A. or smoke concert.

Now without ignoring the possibilities such meetings may afford, surely the cheapness or " un-costingness " of these methods should make us look for a more excellent way. And this way will undoubtedly be more in harmony with Him who is *the* Way.

While our blessed Lord used opportunities for presenting the good news to the general public, He undoubtedly concentrated on raising individuals to a high standard of discipleship. And to do this He called them into close fellowship with Himself and asked of them sacrifice.

In considering these masses, the writer is persuaded that we need to keep a cool head and not be stampeded into special efforts to catch them in shoals. While making use of such opportunities as shew promise of fruitfulness, is it not desirable that we emphasize that truth of the early Church, " live the life and let it work " ?

We do not want a repetition of barbarians (in this case, uninstructed and muddle-headed people) crowding into the Church. There will have to be a large amount of work done with individual souls, and fortunately it will probably be that they will only come singly and not in crowds.

What is it which will best help to attract individual souls ? Surely not something cheap, but what is costly, precious, and that involves sacrifice.

This patiently living the life is Christ's way—a humble way, a painful way, but a sure way, and the only satisfactory way. Not only is it a way which glorifies God by its trustfulness, but it may also be God's way of perfecting His priest by the discipline of the daily round of prayer, services, study, visiting, etc., without seeing much fruit—that will come in His good time.

If the priest is " all out " for Christ and diligently seeking individual souls, then he need not be anxious for the morrow or for the masses. Whether the crowds are converted or die in their sins, a priest's first responsibility is to surrender his own life to God, doing His will within the limitations of His appointing.

This leads to a brief reflection on visiting. Work with individual souls is not only more possible but far more profitable, and it is more likely to issue in building up a congregation of unworldly Christians.

Visiting may seem very slow work, but the Perfect Life was lived out in a slow way—no rushing hither and thither but patiently living and

working for God. Our Lord was faced with the same problem of hundreds of souls all around Him sorely needing what He could give. Yet He concentrated on producing consecrated personalities.

Visiting is one of the tasks of pastoral work where recollection counts for so much. Before the priest visits he should have a clear aim in his mind (*e.g.*, "I am seeking Mr. So-and-so for Christ")—and during the visit he should be striving to be mindful of the Lord's presence in himself or in the parishioner, and deliberately lift him up to God in prayer, even while he is talking to the priest.

This will indeed entail that wrestling in prayer which is so tiring, physically because psychically. But five such visits will be worth five hundred *mere visits*.

Our reading may have a direct bearing on our visiting, particularly in our mental attitude towards the person being visited. Since psychology is the pet "bug" of modern society, numerous books on the subject are pouring from the press to the book-sellers. The subject seems to promise the reader some degree of power or superiority over other persons by enabling him to analyze the springs of their actions and utterances.

It is highly probable that a pastor who reads much modern psychology without balancing it with the study of ethics, philosophy or theology, will visit his people with a wrong background in his mind. His "recollection" will most likely contain a large proportion of "animal instincts," "emotions," "complexes," etc., instead of the unifying (and sane) conception of "a person," "made in the image of God," and "redeemed by the blood of Christ."

As a supplement to visiting—or rather, as an outcome of it, the writer found it possible and most profitable to persuade a small group of men (four in number) to come to his study one night per week. The ostensible reason given then was that, in view of so much misunderstanding about religion they should come and give their priest an opportunity of explaining the Church's teaching, and afterwards they would be free to ask questions or argue. This enabled the priest to give them definite dogmatic teaching, after which there was never any mere fatheaded argufying.

A small group of four men doubtless means slow going, but after three months' instruction they were practically ready for confirmation, and two who had not been confirmed in youth duly received the Gift.

A small class of this size avoids treating men *en masse* and retains much of the individual relationship. Here, again, recollection will let in that mysterious element which gives fire to cold truths uttered by sinful man.

We should not overlook the great possibilities open to the faithful laity, not only of quietly witnessing to Christ by "living the life," but of definitely approaching acquaintances (at convenient times) on the subject of the Catholic Religion.

Whenever they meet with a response they could then arrange for the parish priest to be introduced. The faithful should have this duty and privilege kept before them, but if their priest is himself striving to live simply for God, then his flock (be it ever so small) will be zealous to bring others into contact with such a life. *This* it is which men (though unconsciously perhaps) demand of their priests. They do not require us to be brilliant scholars, clever comedians or respectable gentlemen, but they do expect a priest of God to be a link between them and their

Maker. This does not mean that they cannot have direct communion with God, but it does mean that first, men expect (and rightly) that he who speaks to them about God shall be a living manifestation of Him. And secondly, that men trying to live in the world, but not of the world, have their faith greatly strengthened when always at the back of their minds there is the thought of their priest having left all for God.

The Anglican Church's permission for her clergy to marry has developed into a popular " expectation " that they will do so, and she has lost (with a few exceptions) the witness and the inspiring support of a life obviously being lived for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake.

Instead, we have substituted the parson and the parson's wife busily engaged in various good works and activities in order *to keep the people attending church*—which is not necessarily the same thing as " living the life."

If the pastoral activity of the Church of England is to meet the needs of the present age, it must be expressed through the Clergy House, where priests can give themselves wholly to this one thing, providing one another with the fellowship and discipline of living together and live by Rule a life of definite poverty and consecration.

To this end, it is desirable that candidates for ordination (*i.e.*, men who believe they are called by God) should be willing to serve in the sacred ministry wherever the God who called them shall choose; whether it be in city or country, school or parish, as monk or missionary. For a man who offers himself for Holy Orders, having determined in his mind the sphere of work which will be most agreeable to his personal interests and desires—such a man should be reminded of that dictum in the Epistle to the Hebrews " no man taketh this honour to himself," and he should also be told that he is not called of God, but is seeking the Priesthood of Christ *as a means to some private end.*

Several prominent people have said that we are on the verge of a spiritual revival. And totalitarian states are calling forth (at least temporarily) much self-sacrifice on a materialistic philosophy of life.

When priesthood comes to be regarded not only as the greatest privilege which can be conferred on one *who is not his own, but has been bought with a price,* but also as a state which calls for a generous self-oblation, then some pastoral problems will vanish and others will shrink considerably from their present terrifying proportions.

Is it too optimistic to predict that when the daily offices in our cathedrals are once again chanted, not by paid choristers, but by men who have yielded up their lives entirely to the service of God—that then the Church will be a far greater power in the world than she is today ? That then the talk about empty churches and neglect of religion will cease, and slums, the prostitution of industry for private gain, and other social evils will have a powerful public opinion to deal with them because men have learnt the sacredness of human life by seeing it lived for God ?

E. L. Cassidy, C.A.

IN (INTO) THE NAME

In St. Matt. xxviii. 19 ought we to translate *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* " in " or " into " the Name ?

I notice that Dr. Murray, at the end of his article on " The Foundation of the Church," in your February issue, strongly favours " into," following

the Revised Version. I venture, however, to think that the Authorized Version is right in giving εἰς the sense of "in." To begin with, it is clear that in the New Testament εἰς is sometimes equivalent to ἐν, as when we read in Mark i. 21: "He was teaching εἰς την συναγωγήν." But the point is made clear by the evidence of an ostracon of the second century A.D., given in Deissmann's *Light from the Ancient East*. The translation runs as follows: "Crispus to Na[a]? Pay in the name (εἰς ὄνο—εἰς ὄνομ[α] is so common a formula that it is abbreviated) . . . of Vestidia Secunda represented by Pollia Maria the Younger [such a sum of money]." I have slightly shortened the passage, but it is clear that "in the name" means "on behalf of" and is almost certainly the right translation of εἰς τὸ ὄνομα in the Baptismal formula. If, then, we adopt this rendering we have the appropriate thought that whether in baptizing or in using the common invocation before the sermon the minister is speaking and acting "on behalf" of God. Similarly, when sponsors "promise and vow three things in my name" it obviously means that they do this "on my behalf." ROGER F. MARKHAM.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

THE January issue of the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique* opens with a careful consideration of the creed of the fourth Council of Toledo. In the course of his article upon this creed Father Madoz endorses the view that it amply deserves the name of the "flower of universal credal literature," and he adduces reasons by his comparison of it with other creeds. Father Mollat concludes his learned investigation into the right of patronage in Normandy from the eleventh to the fifteenth centuries. Father Debongnie describes the "levitations" of St. Brigit of Sweden. Her amazing life was among the causes that drove Thomas Arnold, son of the famous headmaster of Rugby, from our communion to that of Rome, and this article leaves us inly wondering at his conversion. R. H. M.

Ephemerides Theologicæ Levanienses. August, 1937.

This number contains several articles of interest. The first, by Fr. Bennefey, O.F.M., is the first instalment of a Thomistic study on "Theology as a Science." In this he discusses the precise meaning of such terms as *doctrina sacra*, the sum total of what has been divinely revealed for our belief. In this sense St. Thomas can speak of sacred doctrine, theology or Holy Scripture indifferently. Outside sacred doctrine are these conclusions which the human mind has reached independently. But the writer contends that the sacred doctrine itself can justly be called a "science." The subject is to be continued. The next article, by Fr. Coppens, one of the Editors of the Review, is entitled, "An Essay in Apologetic Synthesis," putting succinctly the case for Revelation and the Faith on more or less Newmanic lines, quoting freely from the *Grammar of Assent*. He traces briefly the history of monotheism from the early religion of Israel through Deutero-Isaiah up to its developments in the later Judaism, Islam and Christianity. In the last alone it attains its perfection; Christ is the End of all Revelation

the Logos in His plenitude. The Church, too, is a " permanent miracle " and the whole Christian scheme fulfils mysteriously the needs of mankind. Newman's argument from probability is restated and emphasised. But this presentation of the Christian Religion needs to be made to the world not only by professed theologians but by others as well. We should do well to re-read some too much neglected passages in Erasmus, in this his centenary year, and get hints from him in the task of bringing Religion to the enlightened mind of our age. The condition of theological study, as science, in the seminaries is higher than ever, but it is the general diffusion that is needed—here the drawbacks inflicted by the modernist movement have not yet been overcome. This is followed by a résumé of a thesis recently published on the subject of Baptist sects in Palestine at the beginning of, or just before, our era, culminating in the teaching of John. There are notes on Mandæans, Essenes and other sectaries. The next article is a Latin treatise on the anti-modernist oath, discussing the question of the degree and nature of the authority which attaches to it. In the writer's opinion, this is of the highest. When the oath says that the existence of God *adeoque demonstrari etiam potest* it goes beyond what the words of previous authoritative statements have said, and the conclusion is that the demonstrability of the existence of God from a consideration of creation is clearly now *de fide* and moreover *de fide divina et catholica.*

Other articles and the usual very full reviews and theological bibliography complete the number.

W. R. V. Brade.

REVIEWS

HYMNODY PAST AND PRESENT. By the Rev. C. S. Phillips, D.D. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

This is a book of which nothing but good can be spoken. In model fashion it combines learning, lucidity and wit. It combines also a history which is curiously dramatic—for the successive outbursts of Christian hymnody coincide with the great Christian revivals—with a constant survey of the hymn's right place and manner in public worship; issuing in two final chapters of sane and practical counsel to choirs and clergy.

We think therefore that it were more useful to indicate the contents of the book than to hunt for small criticisms of the author's facts or judgments.

The Introduction applies itself to the question, What is a hymn? Dr. Phillips accepts the definition of John Newton: first, it is a religious poem that is designed for public worship; and secondly, one that is designed for the use of plain people. Thus "not only the language and imagery of a hymn but also its sentiment should be suited to the ordinary worshipper."

The bulk of the book concerns itself with the hymn's history. Based largely upon Dr. Frere's remarkable but specialized Introduction to the Historical Edition of *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, Dr. Phillips has produced an even wider survey which will not only be invaluable to students and future editors of hymnaries, but also should make every page of his hymn book interesting to the ordinary church-goer. Having dealt with the origin of the hymn in Bible and early Church, he proceeds to its developments in the Eastern Church, unravelling with brilliant clarity its complexities of construction, metre and liturgical place. Here, as throughout the volume, the author illustrates his title by those hymns of the period which have passed through the sieve of the centuries to familiar use in our own day, giving in each case their number in *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, the *English Hymnal* and *Songs of Praise*.

Latin hymnody, with stress on the definite form that it assumed from the start, occupies Chapters IV and V. "These solemn old hymns (wrote Dr. Bigg) are strong because they are not the outpouring of individual emotion, but an attempt to realize the majesty of God." "They represent (adds Dr. Phillips) the reaction of ascetic Christianity from the licence and frivolity of Paganism, the purging out of the old leaven

that had to precede the return of a now sanctified gaiety to the world in the joyous carollings of the Franciscan revival. Their analogues in the world of art are the stern and massive outlines of Romanesque architecture and the stiff, grim, almost intimidating mosaics that stare at the beholder from the apses and friezes of the churches of Ravenna . . . the essential quality of both is *hieratic:* they breathe the spirit of the great and austere pontiffs who were rebuilding the old *imperium* of Rome into a new shape."

The Reformation in Germany creates the Lutheran chorale. From the musical point of view Dr. Phillips gives it pride of place over all other. Not from the literary; moreover "the difference in the melodic sense of the two nations" has never made even the tunes, with a few famous exceptions, popular with English congregations. England sided with Geneva in preferring a Metrical Psalter, an odd way of satisfying her biblical conscience. Her great race of religious poets made no impression in their own seventeenth century upon this doggerel taste. Give what credit we will to Cosin, Baxter, Ken and the little-known John Mason (1645-94), the modern English hymn was created by the genius of the nonconformist Dr. Isaac Watts.

By Chapter VIII. we have arrived at the Methodist and Evangelical movements—at the two Wesleys who confirmed with irresistible force the work of Watts. It is a little irony of ecclesiastical history that the least liturgically-minded section of the Church of England should have contributed to her liturgical worship the one great addition of the modern centuries. To Charles Wesley the author gives his due rank, among the few supreme hymn writers of all ages.

Fired with the growing but still uncertain popularity of the evangelical hymn, what line would the Oxford Movement take? No sooner did it apply its intensely liturgical mind to the problem than it discovered, of course, that nothing could be more Catholic than the hymn. But while accepting it with enthusiasm, the Tractarians disciplined its use in three ways, and their work here has been endorsed in all provinces of English religion. First, they recurred to the ideal of the objective and doctrinal hymn as distinct from the subjective and personal type dear to evangelical fervour. That involved in consequence an immense energy in translating the hymns of Greek and Latin Christendom, the work which set John Mason Neale on a throne beside Charles Wesley—with the final enduring result of the formation of the modern "Hymn Book," arranged orderly by seasons and rites to be the companion of the liturgical service.

On this historical thread, firmly held, the author strings his masses of detail, bended together by a commentary now pictorial, now critical, now delicately witty, always judicious. For a good example of all these qualities mark pages 242-5, where he deals with the merits and defects of *Songs of Praise*. Dr. Phillips has given us a first-rate book, as accurate in respect of the long and famous past as it is likely to be fruitful for sound judgment in the future.

E. Milner-White.

Personality Survives Death. Communications purporting to be from the late Sir William Barrett. Edited by Lady Barrett, with a foreword by R. J. Campbell, D.D. 5s. net. Longmans.

If mere quantity of evidence were all that was necessary to establish the truth of the spiritistic hypothesis then all men ought by now to be believers. For book after book issues from the press, reporting communications which claim to come from the departed. While many are commonplace, some present a real problem, which cannot be dismissed by uttering the magic word telepathy. Lady Barrett's book records messages received over a period of eleven years. The same tone and character are preserved throughout, and Lady Barrett is convinced that she is in communication with her husband. So apparently is Canon Campbell, who writes a sympathetic Foreword. No one questions the good faith of either Lady Barrett or her medium, Mrs. Leonard. The subjects are often beyond the capacity of the medium in her waking life. If the messages do not come from the dead, where do they come from?

We are warned that a reader of the record cannot appreciate many minute touches which reveal personality and which often bring conviction to a hardened sceptic. That is only to be expected. But a bare reading makes one thing certain, that the medium has, while in trance, access to information unknown at the time either to herself or to the sitter. The book contains many examples. "I have been to another medium," says the alleged communicator, "to send a kind of message through to you. I thought I was clever to push myself through and get it to you by proxy." Lady Barrett elucidates this, which was at the time a mystery to her, as follows. "Miss Bazett met me by chance later and said, 'Sir William came to me one day but only said I was to give you his love and to be sure and use the names Flo and Florence, not the intermediate one with two syllables'"—*i.e.*, Florrie.

The message itself is feeble enough, but the circumstances are curious and call for explanation. Only a few days after Sir William Barrett's death a message was received by a sitter who did not know him personally. She was so impressed that she communicated it to Lady Barrett. It included a cryptic statement that a message had been sent through someone overseas. This turned out to be a communication through Mrs. Piper, the American medium, which when received here, had a perfectly plain meaning. Add to these instances a score or more of others equally remarkable, and the problem grows perplexing. Much, too, of what Lady Barrett says was most evidential of all has had to be suppressed because of its intimate nature. As the record stands in her book, there is no case of failure or even of uncertainty.

Hesitation to accept the spiritistic hypothesis comes from both science and religion. Science is rightly hesitant, because for events that happen in nature it is better to find a natural cause if one can. And when seances are regarded, as they should be regarded in the present state of our knowledge, as scientific experiments, it is difficult to fix the conditions with the precision that science demands. Moreover, it is going too far to say that no other explanation except the spiritistic one can be found. Leaving telepathy on one side, it is possible that a sort of shadow personality becomes detached at death and pursues a flickering existence until at last, like a cloud of smoke, it disintegrates entirely. In the present book the communicator talks at length about physical health, cancer and its prevention and cure, and other scientific matters. It is for scientists to decide whether there is anything original in these utterances. The present writer, speaking as one of the unlearned, obtained the impression that they expressed nothing beyond what is the common teaching of medical men today; that is, they did not appear to proceed from a mind endowed with enhanced power and longer vision, but rather from a shadow mind, giving utterance to thoughts familiar in the earth life.

Religion hesitates on different grounds altogether. The spiritistic explanation may be, of course, the true one. But if it is, then many of our religious ideas, as they have been held by the deepest thinkers for centuries, will have to be recast. For the next world, according to Spiritualism, is not really spiritual at all. It is in time and in space. Draw lines upward from earth into the sky, and the " spirit " England is over the earthly England, Africa over Africa, and so on. True, this was the ancient theory, that the other worlds were physically above us in successive spheres. Origen himself believed some-

thing like this. But Christian thought has moved away from this material doctrine, for such it is, and has tried to envisage a future which, while truly real, is beyond the grasp of our minds in their present state. In these communications, scarcely a sign is given of the existence of men of other nations, except for an occasional Red Indian who flits across to act as a control. Presumably the nations are divided in heaven even more widely than on earth. We are told frequently that those who pass over are "so very happy," but they are all comfortable, middle-class English people. What of the poor and downtrodden, the Chinese children being killed by bombs, the negro in terror before the evil spirits of the forest? Can these not communicate to tell us of their condition? And what of evil itself? Sometimes a hint is given that a certain person was uncomfortable on "passing over," or not fully prepared, but it is assumed that he will improve in time. Do hatred and cruelty automatically perish when we die? The Christian heart would expect the results of sin to be more evident than they are in the anæmic heaven of spiritualistic descriptions. Doubtless the pictures of torment in Christian tradition are exaggerated, but they spring from a genuine demand of the human soul. And what of Christ and God? They are certainly mentioned in this book, but they fulfil no adequate function that I can see. One had the feeling, a mingling of intense hope and intense fear, that after death God would, as it were, fill the whole canvas of our life and that what we knew of earth would be known in Him and through Him. Spiritualism draws, however, quite a different picture. Lady Barrett's book is certainly one to be read and pondered. But there is reason for Christians to pause before accepting its teaching as a new revelation.

G. W. Butterworth.

NOTICES

PASTORALIA

1. The Church and the Challenge of To-day. By the Rt. Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson, Bishop of Derby. Longmans. 4s. 6d. Paper cover, 2s. 6d.
2. Learning and Teaching. By A. G. Hughes, Ph.D., and E. H. Hughes, Ph.D. Longmans. 7s. 6d.
3. The Treatment of Moral and Emotional Difficulties. By Cyril H. Valentine, M.A., Ph.D. S.C.M. 3s. 6d.
4. The Recall to Religion. By various writers, with introductions by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York. Eyre and Spottiswoode. 8s. 6d.

The Church and the Challenge of To-day is the primary visitation charge of the Bishop of Derby. The last three chapters, in which the Bishop declares himself about the conduct of services, the Reserved Sacrament and the Church's discipline of marriage, are primarily of diocesan interest, since he commends to his clergy those decisions on which the majority of the diocesan Bishops are agreed. The importance of the charge, for the general public, is to be found in the ideal of Evangelism which is the heart of the book, and gives it an importance much greater than that of a diocesan charge. It may be supposed that a diocesan Bishop weighs the pros and cons of conducting his primary visitation early or late. The advantages of the bold course are plain enough in the present instance, for it is surely the courage of the leader, who is not yet bruised in the battle, that writes: "If the Christian Church in a particular area were to be compared to an army under its General, and if the Bishop were supposed to be in command, then it is an advance that I should order all along the line!"

And Evangelism would be the army's banner. That, he believes, is primary, even when the claims of worship and teaching are given their due importance in the scale of duties. "There is a work of evangelization, here in our own homeland and in our own county, which cries out to be done." None are likely to suspect him of underestimating the claim of "Sacrament," but it is the "Word" that he sees as primary. "It is in the terms of the Gospel, and in the context of the Gospel, that the sacraments of Christianity alone have their meaning. It is precisely in virtue of this fact, as I believe, that they are to be distinguished in principle from those ritual washings and sacred meals and other half-magical ceremonies, which in the pagan mystery cults of the New Testament era, and later so strikingly and yet (when regard is paid to the theological context) so superficially, resemble them." But what is the Gospel?

Evangelism has often been in need of a theology, even when the need has been unconscious. Modern evangelism knows its need and will welcome the Bishop's counsel. Following Professor Dodd (*The Apostolic Preaching*), he points to the *kerygma* or "proclamation." Behind all that was *taught* in the Christian Church "there was the primary truth of the

kerygma, the free message of God's redemptive grace and decisive act of salvation, wrought out by means of the Passion, Death, Resurrection and Exaltation of Jesus, consummated already in part by means of the dispensation and gift of the Spirit, destined (so men believed) to be consummated completely, in the immediate and imminent future, by means of the final coming of Jesus in glory." This is not an easy message. Some of the Bishop's clergy, perhaps, must have wished, as many of his readers will agree, that he had devoted a long chapter to the exposition of the *kerygma*, for it is on such foundations, and not upon popular and sentimental themes, that English preaching of the future will stand, if the pulpit is to become again the parson's throne. Few, who have noted the difference between the sermons of the Acts of the Apostles and those which so often emanate from the wave-lengths, can doubt that the preaching of the future will recover its doctrine, and make that doctrine alive in a pastoral context.

The Bishop has one further message for the evangelist. The theology of the last century was largely concerned with the doctrine of the Incarnation. We can acknowledge that tremendous debt and yet realize, as he would have us, that " there are ' other ' things also." He sees in some of the works of Brunner, Barth and Aulén a needed revival of Evangelical orthodoxy. Theirs is the note of redemption, and it is the message of redemption that the evangelist must carry in his heart to a world in the crisis of its bewilderment.

If the preparation of ordinands should some day include the study of the science and art of teaching, it is not easy to conceive a more suitable text-book than *Learning and Teaching*. The authors, practical educationists of many years' experience, have the gift of presenting technical information in a setting so human that the novice can read their pages with pleasure. The book will have its special uses in the training-colleges for professional teachers. Here it is more pertinent to suggest that it gives exactly the help required by the priest who is trying (*a*) to understand the day school; (*b*) to grasp the principles of good teaching; (*c*) to deal effectively with a Bible class; (*d*) to make himself an effective teacher in the pulpit. For the book states and explains all the most important principles and methods of good teaching, which are the basis of any successful teaching to be given to children or adults.

" What is man ?" is one of the standing questions of the pastor of souls, and the modern literature of psycho-therapy is important to him as providing some material for his answer. Probably most of us are not called to practise psycho-therapy, in any formal cases, because we have not the time in which to acquire the skill needed for the handling of so sharp a tool. But such books as Dr. Valentine's will help us to understand human nature a little better and are therefore worth their place in the pastor's library.

The names of the contributors to *The Recall to Religion* guarantee good things, and, indeed, it appears with a more than formal commendation from the Archbishop of Canterbury. None the less, no contributor has taken the responsibility of editorship, and presumably other writers, beside Mr. Christie, could have said that they were unaware of the line taken by the other authors. There have been lately signs, which are to be deprecated, of the tendency of publishers to be their own " editor."

But this observation is not intended to detract from the present volume, in which the writers have all a personal authority. The out-

standing contribution is that of Mr. Charles Smyth, with a fine plea for Church attendance grounded on Truth, as it is found in the Body of Christ. In the course of his essay he has to castigate the weaker side of the late Dick Sheppard's message to the Sunday press, and no doubt the essay would have been redrafted if the author could have foreseen the bereavement of last November. Even so it stands as a criticism which many of Dick Sheppard's admirers would allow to be just. On the constructive side is to be noted Mr. Smyth's faith in the power of modern youth to recognize divine truth and to welcome it.

Indeed, much of the volume is concerned with young people, and this is one of its many merits. Miss Dent writes with distinction and sympathy a chapter for parents, which one wishes could be presented after every Baptism. Mr. Christie gives a fine ideal of "Divinity" in school. What apparently he partly fails to see is that "Divinity equals Religious Education" is not an equation. On the desk-calendar of every educationist one would like to write: "Divinity is not enough." A boy (or girl) does not begin to profit by "Divinity" until reality, suited to his spiritual development, has come into his prayers; the New Testament is a fragrant piece of Palestinian biography or antiquity until he has found his place in the fellowship of his Baptism; he will not learn the Church's love of God by "the personality of Christ," but by that faith in the Father who made him and the Holy Spirit who sanctifies him, as well as in the Christ who redeems him, which is summarized in the Catechism. For the headmasters and headmistresses, who are so obviously struggling to make the best of a tradition which they did not create, the question of the future may be: "How can the gist of the Catechism find its way into 'Divinity' without wrecking the *concordat* of Public School Religion?" The alternative is the perpetuation of a fellowship, however sincere and informed, of creed-less and church-less "Bible Christians."

The Bishop of Bristol, in a most valuable essay on "The Causes of Decline," pleads for the presentation of fundamental doctrine in a message "that quite simply puts God first," and the Bishop of Lichfield gives a radiant account of "Religion and Morality" which deserves to be remembered in the recall to Christian standards. The other essays, of which detailed mention is precluded, together with the Archbishop of York's characteristic introduction, make up a symposium which will guide and encourage the clergy who want to look forward and are more than a little muddled, as most of us are, by present-day omens.

J. R. Lumb.

First Chapters in Religious Philosophy. By Vergilius Ferm. Putnam. 10s. 6d.

This book is the outcome of a course in the philosophy of religion given to students at Wooster College, U.S.A. It is intended partly for students unfamiliar with the subject and partly as a text-book. Part I. deals with definitions of religion and religious experience. As Professor Ferm holds it an error to define "religion in terms of its highest reaches," one can hardly quarrel with him for the glaring omissions in his illustra-

tions of religious experience (taken from the Kentucky Revival, the Today-Dairy Priests, etc.), though one might argue that his view is faulty. Part II. deals with arguments for belief in God, theories of value, determinism, prayer, immortality. In the hands of a skilful teacher the book might be useful in leading a student to clarify his thought by criticizing both parties, and might send him back to the original authors to see if their thinking was as obviously fallacious as the skeleton-character of a text-book makes it appear. GRETA HORT.

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES. By Sir Robert Falconer. Clarendon Press. 12s. 6d.

A new commentary on the Greek text happily supplements E. F. Scott's commentary on the English in the Moffatt Bible. The author is a veteran scholar very well equipped for his task; the book is full of charm as well as exact scholarship. Perhaps it is all the more helpful to the student in that it is not always convincing and his critical faculties are kept awake. Most of us will agree that the Epistles are Pauline, but not Paul's. But the exact demarcation of sources attempted by Sir Robert is probably impossible of achievement. The material is sixfold. (*a*) A genuine letter written by the Apostle—about half of 2 Timothy and three verses of Titus. (*b*) Material with a Pauline base. (*c*) A fragment on Church order (Tit. i. 7-9; 1 Tim. iii. 1*b*-13). (*d*) A floating Christian prophecy (2 Tim. iii. 1-9). (*e*) A tractate on Christian piety and Church Order—much of 1 Timothy. (*f*) And, finally, additions by the editor, found in all three Epistles. The subjective element in all this is obvious.

The translation is much more readable than that of the Revised Version, at the expense sometimes of accuracy. The following examples from 2 Timothy will enable the reader to decide whether or not he thinks an ancient document should be translated in this manner. 2 Tim. i. 4: "when I think of the tears you shed at our parting" (R.V. "remembering thy tears"); i. 5: "and, as I have said, this faith of your heritage has, I am sure, a home also in your own heart" (R.V. "and, I am persuaded, in thee also"); i. 6: "since the day when my hands were laid upon you in ordination" (R.V. "through the laying on of my hands"); i. 12: "my faith and fortunes, which I have placed in his keeping" (Greek *τὴν παραθήκην μου*—R.V. "that which I have committed unto him"); ii. 10: "on behalf of God's people whom he has chosen out of the world" (R.V. "for the elect's sake"). The last is a particularly good example. Does "the elect" mean more than the members of the Ecclesia, all summoned by God's trumpet call? In practice they were called out of the world, but should this be added to a translation?

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE HIGHWAY TO HEAVEN AND A BYWAY TO NOWHERE. By F. Hugh Capron. Methuen. 5s.

The sub-title to this book is "An Answer to Spiritualism." A recent publication by a person of eminence in the spiritualistic world has retold the Bible stories in "psychic" fashion, and Mr. Capron sets himself the task of exposing the absurdities of the new exegesis. For instance, the Biblical term God is sometimes interpreted in its natural meaning, but in many instances it is rendered as "spirit-guide." If we were to take this seriously it would rob the Old Testament of all its power, for instead of introducing men to God it leaves them conversing with "spirits," exactly as modern Spiritualism does. Some readers may not be able to follow Mr. Capron in every detail of his argument; but his main position is undoubtedly sound. He knows what religion is, and he sees that Spiritualism is the negation of religion, leading nowhere.

G. W. BUTTERWORTH.

SAINT AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO. Essays dealing with his Life and Times, and some features of his work. Sands and Co. 12s. 6d.

Father Hugh Pope's Essays are certified as orthodox by a "Nihil obstat" and an imprimatur from the Vicar-General at Westminster; and, indeed, with the exception of a few controversial opinions on the crime of schism and religious intolerance, would be generally endorsed outside the Roman obedience, being chiefly concerned with such subjects as Christian Life in Africa in Augustine's time, and with Augustine himself as a preacher and a writer of letters. The Church in Hippo must have been very strong numerically in Augustine's time, since he declared in a sermon that there were many houses in which there was not even a single pagan, nor a single house in which there was not a Christian.

Father Pope relates that on October 1, 1695, there was discovered at Pavia a white marble sarcophagus and a silver chest, wherein lay what was acclaimed as the body of St. Augustine. "The identification," he says, "was at once disputed, and the discussion raged for some fifteen years, until Pope Benedict XIII. published a Constitution . . . in which he gave the details of the translation of the remains" from Hippo. The story is that the African Bishops, expelled by the Vandal invasion, brought the body to Sardinia, whence it was removed to Pavia, and there fell into oblivion and only rediscovered some 800 years later. The celebrated student Muratori "went so far as to maintain that the remains were merely those of some unknown martyr." "Now, however," says Father Pope, "the identification is generally accepted."

The Essay on St. Augustine the Preacher collects from the Sermons many interesting details about the Bishop's style and method, with illustrations of his humour, as when he remarked, "Do not imagine that heresies are the product of little minds. It takes a big mind to make a heresy, but the bigger the mind, the worse." A discriminating criticism follows about the Authenticity of Augustine's Sermons. As to the 396 Sermons in Migne there is no question. Since 1683, 640 more Sermons

have been brought to light and attributed by various sponsors to Augustine. Of these Dom Morin allows the claims of only 138.

The next Essay is on St. Augustine the letter-writer. His correspondence occupies no less than one thousand and thirty-four closely written columns in Migne's Latin Patriology. His letters are often, as Father Hugh Pope says, "veritable treatises running to a prodigious length." They were often dictated. Much is said of Secretaries, or as the Romans called them Notaries, professional scribes, sometimes very inefficient. We gain much interesting information from these pages about the difficult conditions under which correspondence was conducted. Much also about letters that went astray. "To trust the post in the fourth century was heroic." "I have no idea," writes Augustine, "when this my reply will reach you, but I do not give up all hope."

A separate study of Augustine's interest in the world of Nature is quite a fresh aspect of the great African's character.

The remaining chapters are concerned with the crime of schism, and with Augustine as a model of tolerance. Both of these would, from a Catholic standpoint as contrasted with a Roman Catholic, require reconsideration.

The volume ends with an elaborate classification of Augustine's writings in chronological order. Such a study as this is a solid contribution to our knowledge.

W. J. Sparrow Simpson.

Science and Common Sense. By W. R. Thompson, F.R.S. Longmans. 7s. 6d.

Dr. Thompson makes two points in this book. First that scientific conclusions to be correct must accord with "the rules of right thinking laid bare"—if any process of thought leads to the conclusion that a thing both is and is not, then that conclusion is self-condemned. As an example he gives the description of the observer stationary on the earth and the aviator flying above the earth, both of whom may be said to be stationary or moving. Dr. Thompson demands that one of them should be "really" stationary, and the other "really" moving; as the theory refuses to grant this, it should be discarded. To which one may answer that all conclusions based on the short-hand illustrations of physicists are likely to be wide of the mark when made by the non-physicist, as the latter does not possess the background of knowledge necessary for making the short-hand intelligible. This, however, is only another way of stating Dr. Thompson's second point, that the method of one science when applied within another is misleading, unless we remember that we are using borrowed methods, and have cut our object to fit our method; mathematics can give us mathematical truth, not biological; and the same holds good about biology, physics and philosophy. Dr. Thompson's illustrations here and his examination of the theory of Evolution are interesting, and should help to clear away many popular misconceptions.

Finally, Dr. Thompson wishes to establish the epistemological

position that everywhere we touch reality, that phenomena are appearances of reality, and that there is nothing in the mind which has not first been in the senses. Consequently, Common Sense "*must* be in fundamental accord with Science," which rests on the assumption of "the fundamental truthfulness of the images presented by the senses." Dr. Thompson has called his book an Aristotelian Excursion; it might more properly be called a Thomistic Excursion. GRETA HORT.

SAINT PETER. By Francis Underhill, D.D., Bishop of Bath and Wells. Centenary Press. 7s. 6d.

In this book the Bishop of Bath and Wells sets out to give us a life of St. Peter intended, as he tells us, for the general reader and not for experts; he deals at length with the Apostle as revealed in the gospels and Acts, with his relationships with SS. Paul and James, with his Epistles, his connection with the Gospel of St. Mark, his sojourn and martyrdom at Rome and the apocryphal works which centre upon his name.

The subject-matter is very diverse and it is perhaps no matter for wonder that the book itself lacks unity. The charming descriptiveness of the first chapters is hardly sustained in the later ones, so that whereas the gospel background is full and vivid the background of the later history, which the general reader needs far more, is not so. It is also a pity that the Acts of Peter, with their many ridiculous stories, are so fully described in a book which professedly deals with facts, though Dr. Underhill, of course, does not claim for them more than legendary value.

The reader will be grateful to Dr. Underhill for a book which deals fully and fairly with all that is known concerning the Prince of the Apostles; particularly will he be glad to have the evidence for his sojourn in Rome so clearly stated. F. P. HARTON.

AN AMBASSADOR IN CHAINS. By Arthur Karney, D.D., Bishop of Southampton. Mowbrays. 5s.

This is a popular book, being a series of chapters, which began life as Cathedral sermons, on the Epistles of the Captivity and what the author calls "St. Paul's Prison Prayers."

Many people who read the gospels with profit do not know what to make of St. Paul and so leave him alone to their great loss; Dr. Karney shews them in this book how St. Paul may be read with profit, as well as giving an exposition of his four easier but most important epistles which is scholarly without being burdensome and at the same time practical and vigorous. He is by no means afraid of facing facts, and applies

St. Paul's teaching to modern life trenchantly. It is a very living book.

To the clergy it will be useful as first of all encouraging them to practise the well-nigh lost art of expository preaching and then shewing them how it may be done. Apathy in regard to Holy Scripture is a cause of much futile religion; Dr. Karney's exposition should do much to remove this and encourage the clergy generally to assist in its removal.

F. P. Harton.

Convocation of the Clergy. By Dorothy Bower Weske, A.M., Ph.D. Church Historical Society. S.P.C.K. 15s.

Dr. Weske's scholarly work represents a very notable achievement in a somewhat specialized field. The core of the book is an intensive study of the workings of the Convocations in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. An introductory chapter traces the development of ecclesiastic assemblies in England from 597 to 1295: the principal landmark is the decree of *circa* 1072, which separated the ecclesiastical from the secular courts, and thereby encouraged the Church to think of itself as an entity apart from the State. The first use of the word *convocatio* for an ecclesiastical council in England is found in 1125.

The dominant factor in the development of Convocation in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries was the natural reluctance of the clergy to attend ecclesiastical assemblies. Attendance, whether in Parliament or in Convocation, was an expensive matter, especially for bishops, who frequently pleaded ill health or infirmity as an excuse for absence. Moreover, from the standpoint of the lower clergy, attendance in Parliament was altogether, in Convocation not altogether, a waste of time. "The position of the lower clergy in parliament was nominal; in convocation it was important" (p. 79), for it was fully established before the middle of the fourteenth century that grants or spiritualities—*i.e.*, the taxes paid by the clergy—were voted in Convocation, not in Parliament: besides, in Convocation they had more opportunity to discuss their grievances. In consequence, the clergy deflected their activity more and more to their own separate body. Their attendance at it was still grudging, and had to be enforced by threats of punishment for absence: but by the end of the fourteenth century the framework of procedure had already become fixed.

Having established their right to tax themselves without interference from the laity, the clergy began to recognize with increasing clarity that the voting of grants was, or ought to be, connected with the redress of grievances. They were seldom in a sufficiently strong position to carry their point: nevertheless, the stand thus taken by the clergy did mean, as Dr. Weske points out, a gain for "constitutional principles." This theme is further developed in the concluding chapter ("Convocation a contributory force to the development of the English Constitution"), in which Dr. Weske dismisses in her stride the suggestion, made by Dr. Ernest Barker in 1913, that for the system of representation in England we are particularly indebted to the Dominican Order, but

insists that we are more indebted than is generally recognized to the conciliar activity of the Church.

There are three Appendices and a Bibliography, all no less valuable than voluminous. The name of Dr. Weske must be added to the distinguished roll of American historians who have laid students of English constitutional history under a signal debt.

CHARLES SMYTH.

ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS. By Hugh J. Schonfield. Duckworth. 10s. 6d.

The sub-title of this learned book is "A New Translation of the Jewish Life of Jesus (the *Toldoth Jeshu*), with an Inquiry into the Nature of its Sources and Special Relationship to the Lost Gospel according to the Hebrews." The *Toldoth Jeshu*, or "Generations of Jesus," is a parody of the Gospel story, published originally (Mr. Schonfield believes) during the fourth century, and becoming more and more scandalous in succeeding editions, as the bitterness between Jews and Christians increased. Mr. Schonfield gives us this document in a new translation, based on a critical text, and compares it with early Jewish, Christian and Islamic writings. The main object of the book is to elaborate the author's view that the *Toldoth* is a counterblast to that Gospel according to the Hebrews, which is traditionally held to be one of the sources of our canonical Gospel according to St. Matthew. Some of Mr. Schonfield's suggestions are startling, and they should no doubt be received at this stage with caution; but his work, which embodies the results of much research in a field that he has made his own, and contains a large amount of curious information, may be commended to the attention of the discriminating reader.

S. L. BROWN.

ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL, LONDON: THEN AND NOW. By Arthur E. Henderson, F.S.A., R.B.A., F.R.I.B.A. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

This book contains a series of sketches of the various buildings which have in turn occupied the site of St. Paul's Cathedral, in many cases set side by side with illustrations of the views seen at present from the same position. Some of the drawings, such as those of the temple of Diana and of the Saxon Church, are almost entirely conjectural but not unconvincing. In depicting the Norman and Gothic buildings the artist has had more data to work upon, and Mr. Henderson has produced some strikingly beautiful sketches reconstructing the glory of Old St. Paul's, in particular the full-length view of the Norman building and the sketch shewing the North Transept with the Rood and the Crossing in front of the Choir Screen. The letterpress is not altogether satisfactory; there are lapses in style, and owing to the placing side by side on opposite

pages of modern photographs and conjectural sketches, it is difficult at first to know for certain to which the description below refers. These defects jar in a book so well got up in other respects. The photographs are excellent; the reconstructive sketches are beautifully done and, despite one or two admitted anachronisms, architecturally flawless.

HERBERT REES.

THE SAINTS AND MY OWN LIFE. By W. M. Bull. Mowbray. 3s. 6d.

The stories of the Saints here collected are unhackneyed and for the most part intrinsically interesting and admirably told. Each is followed by questions for self-examination and by a resolution. These features are of doubtful value. Life in the modern world is so different from that of the mediæval cloister that meditation on these lines is not to be recommended; at least the stories are a poor substitute for the Bible. For example, Margaret Alacoque couldn't eat cheese. With awful repugnance she forced herself to eat it, for love of Jesus. "*Resolution.* With St. Margaret Mary, I will eat whatever it is next time, cost what it may"—for there must be no reserve in love. Blessed Anna Maria Taigi told her father she had learned housekeeping partly from our Lady. "*Resolution.* I will take our Lady into my daily confidence about the anxieties arising from my duties connected with housekeeping or entertaining." These examples will be enough to shew the tone of the book. It is not manly piety. Would devout women be pleased to hear it called feminine piety?

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE WAILING WALL. By Olga Levertoff. Mowbray. 3s. 6d.

The beautiful photograph of the author which appears as a frontispiece suggests that the value of this book consists largely in the personal approach of the gifted young writer. Which indeed is the case. The publisher's puff, which cannot be separated from the binding, calls the book "the most penetrating and original contribution to the problem of 'the Christian approach to the Jew' that has ever appeared" and antagonizes the would-be purchaser. (St. Paul in the Epistle to the Romans was probably more original and certainly went deeper.) This is a pity, for Miss Levertoff has access to many little known facts and writes very well.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE SAINTS OF EGYPT. By De Lacy O'Leary. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

The writer's aim has been to provide a compendium of information concerning the martyrs and other saints honoured in the Coptic Church. He follows the biographies given in the Jacobite (Synaxarium), but he follows it in the light of recent research. That is to say, the unprinted

and the printed sources are elaborately set down. The unprinted sources cover all the codices in the libraries of Europe, and wherever we have been able to test this claim it is fully substantiated. The printed sources give all the older ones, save in the instances where these older ones have been superseded by modern editions. In addition to what we have stated is in this book, there is a brief account of the foundation of the Church of Alexandria, the Coptic language, the Egyptian martyrs, and Egyptian monasticism. Incidentally we have often wondered what conception of the Church a man like St. Simeon Stylites entertained, for it is obvious that for years he never could have received Holy Communion.

R. H. Murray.

Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina. By G. Dalman. Band V. 22 M.

Dalman's great work on "work and custom" is at last finished. The first volume described the seasons; the second, agriculture; the third, the processes of milling; the fourth, bread, oil and wine. The present book deals with weaving, spinning, clothes, and the materials of which they are comprised. A lifetime spent largely in Palestine combines with exhaustive research into all the available documentary evidence to produce a work encyclopædic in its scope. The present customs are described with a fulness all the more valuable in that they are rapidly changing. After laying a solid foundation of what is known from direct observation, Dalman in each case proceeds to the Biblical evidence, which is given exhaustively. Post-biblical material is used only when necessary to supplement the evidence of the Bible.

One example may be cited of the extraordinary care with which Dalman works. A section deals with men's pants: exact descriptions are given of the design and measurements, to two places of decimals, of those worn by Bedouin, inhabitants of Haifa or Lebanon, etc. The antiquity counterpart of this has little to go upon except the drawers worn by the priests. The motive of this almost incredibly painstaking work is to establish the concrete reality of the world from which Christianity arose. No detail is too trivial for the devoted author.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

The Challenge of the North-West Frontier. A Contribution to World Peace. By C. F. Andrews. George Allen and Unwin. 3s. 6d.

This little book is both interesting and timely. Interesting, because C. F. Andrews speaks with first-hand knowledge of Indian affairs, and always in his own vivid way; timely, because England is deeply uneasy at world-wide preparations for war, and dislikes her own almost as much as she fears other people's. At heart we are a kindly nation, though

an illogical one, for we drop bombs on frontier tribesmen while condemning Italians and Japanese for large-scale operations of the same kind.

C. F. Andrews reminds us that it is the English who have educated the Hindus out of their docility and made many of them, not only politically self-conscious, but extremely critical. Political understanding with them should be possible, since it is English ideals that have made them what they are. Frontier tribesmen, however, do not come to English Universities, or "fail B.A." in India, before embarking on their careers. They are Mohammedans, with the traditional Moslem mentality. C. F. Andrews believes that they could be best understood, and, if understood, pacified, by their Mohammedan brethren on the Indian side of the border.

He bids us look, not only away from England, and past Geneva, to the confines of India, but further still to the Far East, over which the dark wings of war are, at this moment outstretched. The problem of War or Peace is a world-problem and as such it must ultimately be solved.

Cast your mind's eye over the last hundred and fifty years of world-history. Take a pencil and paper and write down the names of those conquerors whose victories have endured. Truly the hold of the warlike over their empires is precarious in the extreme!

Are our Lord's words literally true, and will the meek, and only the meek, at last inherit the earth?

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

THE CHRISTIAN'S CLAIM ABOUT JESUS OF NAZARETH: PERFECT GOD AND PERFECT MAN. By Clement F. Rogers, M.A. S.P.C.K. 2s.

This book originally appeared as a pamphlet in 1916; the author has now rewritten and enlarged it. The last chapter, discussing alternatives to the Christian belief about Christ, is wholly new; the first three chapters, on what the first Christians believed, what Jesus Himself claimed, and the credibility of the claim, are written with all the cogency acquired by long experience in popular apologetics. Nevertheless, it is not easy to be sure for whom this book is intended. The browser in church tract-cases will not be convinced by quotations from *Pastor Pastorum* (Cambridge, 1890) and will never have heard of Bp. Lightfoot's *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, while the "intellectual" will want something more "up-to-date" than Liddon's Bampton Lectures or the personal opinions of Bp. Gore or the Gifford Lecturer of 1904 on the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel. The repeated quotations from Browning and A. H. Clough have the effect of "dating" the book, and while nothing is more foolish than to decry the wisdom of our fathers (and, particularly in theology, of our grandfathers) yet apologetic cannot afford to appear behind the times.

The chapter on what Jesus claimed for Himself is a forcible piece of argument, and Professor Rogers has done good service in reminding us that the dilemma "Aut Deus aut homo non bonus" is as inescapable as ever.

HERBERT REES.

THE ELEMENTS OF COMPARATIVE THEOLOGY. By F. Harold Smith, D.D. Duckworth. 5s.

Dr. Smith is a brave man to have written such a book as this. He needs, and I hope will find, brave men and women to read it. Many people find Comparative Theology an extremely alarming subject. They begin to shiver when they learn that there are Buddhist Beatitudes; and pages by Sufi mystics, which might have been written by Raymond Lull or St. Gertrude, fill them with alarm. It is useless to remind them that there is only one God from whom all holy desires, all good counsels and all just works do proceed, and that the existence of some glimmer outside Christianity in no way darkens the Light of the World.

I send such timorous folk to Dr. Smith's book. There they, as well as their braver brethren, will get much good. Set out before us are all religions that have any claim to importance. We approach them by way of their sacred books, some of which are reverenced as inspired, while others have no claim to be anything but ordinary human writings. Ideas of God and of the nature of Reality are next considered; then Cosmology and Cosmogony, "Man and the Good Life," and, lastly, Salvation. (If you are not quite certain what "kathenotheistic," "correlative dualism," "pantheistic acosmism," etc., mean, you had better have your dictionary handy.)

The vast scope of the book suggests that our courage is to be tested by a work of the size of Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. But not at all! We emerge at the end of 236 pages, really enlightened and intellectually refreshed, though perhaps glad we are not about to be examined on all that we have read.

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher